63 Periodicals
Royal

SH
WITHDRAWN

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
LIBRARY

23 JUL 1979

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/royal-historical-society-london-england-transactions_1937_20

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

The Society, AS A BODY, *is not responsible for the opinions advanced in the following pages.*

TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Fourth Series

VOLUME XX

LONDON
OFFICES OF THE SOCIETY
96 CHEYNE WALK, S.W.10
1937

SHL
WITHDRAWN
BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV.

BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV.

Made and Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner Ltd., Frome and London

CONTENTS

PAGE

Presidential Address. By Professor F. M. Powicke, *M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., F.B.A.* 1

Bismarck and England in the Earlier Period of his Career. By Professor V. Valentin, *Ph.D.* . . . 13

The Manning of the Navy in the West Indies, 1702–63. By R. Pares, *M.A., F.R.Hist.S.* 31

The Duke of Mar in Exile, 1716–32. By Maurice Bruce, *B.A.* 61

The East India Company "Interest" and the English Government, 1783–4. By C. H. Philips, *B.A.* . . 83

Ranulf de Gernons, Earl of Chester, 1129–53. By H. A. Cronne, *M.A., F.R.Hist.S.* 103

Richard de Bury (1287–1345). By N. Denholm-Young, *M.A., F.R.Hist.S.* 135

The Chronology of Labour Services. By M. Postan, *M.Sc., F.R.Hist.S.* 169

Index 195

Report of the Council 207

List of Fellows 232

List of Publications 267

TRANSACTIONS
OF THE
ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Delivered 11 *February,* 1937

BY PROFESSOR F. M. POWICKE, M.A., LITT.D., LL.D., F.B.A.

ON previous occasions I have chosen as the subject of my address at the annual meeting of this Society a historical theme suggested by my studies. Three historical addresses, each of which involved careful preparation, are, I venture to think, as many as a President of the Society need feel it his duty to deliver. Yet I think that I should have inflicted a fourth upon the Society if some special considerations had not combined to divert me from what is certainly the safer, and is perhaps the more profitable course. Moreover, it so happens that the period of my presidency has been a time of significant development in the organisation of historical study in this country. The history of this Society has been affected by the general movement. We have tried deliberately to adjust ourselves to it, and to take a leading part in it. I decided, therefore, to make my last appearance in the chair an occasion for a review of current developments and for some reflections upon them.

As we look round this room to-day and remember how it has looked on similar occasions in the last decade, we might well feel that, in an unstable world, the Royal Historical Society is one of the few fixed points. Old faces go, new faces come, slight changes can be traced in the faces which remain, but our procedure is the same, and the physical and mental atmosphere is the same. I imagine that, in its new quarters—so appropriately hallowed by dignified historical tradition, and so beautiful and dignified themselves—the Society will retain its own traditions of Victorian decorum, and sedate self-possession. As the years go by, the most obvious change in its life is one which, in its remorseless recurrence, is the most insistent of all testimonies to the unchanging nature of things. Year by year, death takes from us honourable, useful and learned men and women, almost as many as the new fellows who are elected to our Society. According to the Report presented four years ago, there were 888 Fellows of this Society ; the Report presented to us to-day gives the number 915. During this time it has lost 84 Fellows through death. I am especially bound to recall the name of my predecessor, Sir Richard Lodge, who in his last years renewed his youth in the service of history. Then Sir Charles Firth, also a former President, has gone, nearly the last of a noble group of scholars, for the like of which we have to look back to the days of Madox and Tanner and Wanley. Among others who served this Society we remember Sir John Fortescue, President, Eleanor Lodge, J. E. Morris, C. W. Foster and Maude Clarke, whom I am privileged to number among the first and most brilliant of my pupils. Lord Fitzmaurice, Sir Frederick Pollock, T. Rice Holmes, Sir Robert Rait and J. F. Willard, a dear friend to many of us—all Honorary Vice-Presidents—have gone during the last four years. William Page, who has left the Victoria County Histories as his monument, audited our accounts from 1917 to 1928. Lady Burgclere, Sir George Cory, Sir Vincent Evans, F. C. Montague, F. S. Oliver, Cecil Headlam, D. C. Munro and that amazing polymath, J. K. Fotheringham, were Fellows of this Society. Sir Arthur C. Doughty, whose work as archivist in Ottawa marked an epoch in colonial history, was a corresponding member ; as were those great European scholars, Émile Bourgeois, Henri Pirenne and Alfred Stern. The mere recital of these names helps us to realise the range and vitality of the learning represented by the Society. And we would also remember two other names of two warm friends of the Society, Sir Cato Worsfold, a Fellow, who served us so long and so ably as Honorary Solicitor, and Lady Prothero, who, though she was not in name one of us, retained to the last the eager interest in our affairs which she had shared so long with her husband, our greatest benefactor.

These recollections, some of which give us a link with the earlier days of the Society, almost with the age of Earl Russell himself, recall us to a sense of our continuous life in the midst of death. Yet, as I have suggested, the Society, with no forgetfulness of its past but, rather, in a spirit of service to its traditions, has found itself affected by the more self-conscious historical movement of our own day. During the last four years an older tendency towards orderliness and co-operation in the historical world seems to me to have become more rapid, and more carefully directed. We are aware of its possibilities. The activity of the Historical Association and the Anglo-American conferences arranged by the Institute of Historical Research have undoubtedly helped to hasten the process by breaking through old barriers and by awakening widespread interest in the problems of teaching and research. The British Academy, by giving countenance and financial support to the Place Name Society and other learned enterprises, has done a service which goes beyond the limits of its practical help. The steady and growing passage to and fro of students and teachers between the Universities, the British Museum, the Public Record Office and the Institute implies much more than the additions to knowledge which may be its result. Moreover, as the Universities take a more active share in the encouragement of advanced study and its teachers become better acquainted, by travel and personal friendships as well as by reading, with the movements of learning outside this country, the beginner is better able to feel at home in the wide world of learning than he was when I was young. He responds more quickly and naturally. Both as a teacher and as a student of history I am conscious of a change in the academic atmosphere and I imagine that the impulse towards co-ordination, which has of late years been so widely felt, owes much of its vigour to the influence of this change. On all sides historians are taking stock, improving their tools and making arrangements with each other. Field archæology has become a widespread scientific adventure, and has ceased to be the desultory interest of an unco-ordinated band of specialists and amateurs. The new *Complete Peerage* is more than a safe work of reference; it is a sign of the victory of organised genealogical research over the doubtful antecedents which have hampered the subject for so long. Again, the formation of and response to the Council for the Preservation of Business Archives illustrates the wider and more confident interest in history taken by the business man no less than the alertness of our economic historians.

Three developments of major significance can be seen in the activities of the Institute of Historical Research, the rapid growth of the British Records Association and the part played by British scholars, through the British National Committee, in international historical enterprise. During the last four years the Institute has given a sharper edge to its policy and taken a lead in the adjustment of its work to the work of others. Its library policy has as its aim careful provision for the studies in which it specialises and helpful regard to the ways in which the Institute can co-operate with other libraries. Its great task of completing the Victoria County Histories has been organised with astonishing rapidity and, *inter alia*, has helped to focus the interest of Oxford and Cambridge in their own antiquity. The function of the Institute as a national clearing house is admirably performed by various publications in and supplementary to its Bulletin: the reports on the work of societies, the detailed description of the accessions to collections of manuscripts and on the migrations of manuscripts, the annual lists of theses completed and in progress, and the guide to the historical publications of the societies of England and Wales. I should like here to express the formal thanks of this Society for the helpful co-operation of the Institute with us in the preparation of our annual Bibliography, to which I shall refer later. If you look at Mr. Parsloe's introduction to the last issue of his Guide [1] you will see that he has agreed to provide us with material from the publications of non-historical societies (whose occasional historical papers are so easily overlooked) and has so arranged his own work in the Guide as to adjust it to our plan.

The British Records Association came into existence shortly before I took office. Its remarkable development is therefore as good an illustration as we could have of the culmination of tendencies in resolute and conscious effort. The Association has already succeeded in bringing together local record societies, libraries, county and municipal authorities, and even the custodians of private and ecclesiastical archives. The local repositories entitled to take charge of historical documents under the direction of the Master of the Rolls have been supplemented by a central clearing house in Lincoln's Inn, where the Records Preservation Section has its office. At the same time the various Committees of the Association have been engaged in a survey and classification of archives of all kinds and in work on the regulations which affect the custody of local archives. The sense of unity and confidence which has resulted from these and other activities of the Association will undoubtedly strengthen the desire for a common policy and will encourage further effort in the collection, preservation, study and publication of historical documents.

The work of the British National Committee—one of many national committees which co-operate in carrying through the enterprises of the International Historical Congress and its various commissions—is not so easily appreciated. I can best illustrate its value by reminding you that, through its action, several international commissions have been able to enlist the support of our own Society, the Historical Association and the Institute of Historical Research. The British contribution to the commission concerned with teaching is made by the Historical Association. Our Society undertook the work required by the commission engaged in the compilation of chronological lists. The Institute has agreed to provide the information required by the commission on abbreviations. But we can receive as well as give; and I venture here to remind you of the International Bibliography to which English helpers contribute year by year, and of the useful articles, generally of a bibliographical nature, which appear from time to time in the Bulletin of the International Committee. The last issue, for example, is devoted to a preliminary world-list of historical reviews. These publications are not so well known in this country as they deserve to be.

---

[1] Bulletin: Supplement no. 7, November 1936.

In the course of this brief survey I have already had occasion to refer to the co-operation of this Society in the historical movements about us. It is time to speak more directly of our recent history.

You will, I am sure, forgive me if at this point I recall a discussion which we had here in December 1932 [1] during the last year of Sir Richard Lodge's presidency. On that occasion I was speaking as a free lance, and could not even be certain that my suggestions had any practical value at all. Events have shown, however, that the conclusions which we reached during that discussion could find a place in our programme. May I read a few sentences?

1. "In the first place, can members of the Royal Historical Society, as individuals, do something to aid some at least of [current] enterprises? I venture to mention one, a child of the International Historical Committee."

---

[1] See *Transactions*, Fourth Series, xvi, 1933, pp. 45–53.

2. " Ought the Society to have a deliberate, permanent policy, by which it is prepared to stand, and to advance which it is prepared, if necessary, to modify its constitution or to depart from its traditions ? " I proceeded to suggest the reorganisation of the Library and the creation of a class of Associates.
3. " What about the distribution of our funds between our more casual semi-social activities and the most important and valuable part of all our work, our publications ? "

The subject of the discussion in December 1932 was modern methods of studying medieval history, and it is important to remember that, in later consideration of the issues raised, the obligation of the Society to promote the study of all English history, whether medieval or modern, had also to be kept in mind. It was, in fact, kept in mind, and I am not sure that the result of our attempt to enforce the policy outlined in 1932 will not prove to be even more helpful to the students of modern than to the students of medieval history. Needless to say, this Society, except for purposes of convenience, does not recognise the distinction and admits no cleavage, other than that of convenience, between the periods into which our history is customarily divided.

It will be agreed, I think, that the Society is well on the way to the formulation of a " definite policy." The Council, in view of problems which would arise in the near future and of the general developments which I have tried to illustrate, gradually " cleared the decks," if you will allow a nautical metaphor. The constitution of Council and of its committees was revised ; its procedure, by the circulation of minutes and careful memoranda and other expedients, was made more effective ; it devised a pension scheme for its full-time paid officers ; it examined the relation between the financial claims of the library, the publications and establishment, and instituted separate and accruing accounts for the two former ; it was able to secure the services as honorary secretary of Professor

Bellot, to whom the Council is already very greatly indebted. The two proposals made in 1932 have been adopted. We now have a library of English history, strengthened by most of the late Sir George Prothero's books, and specialising in the more general texts and in the publications of our local societies. And we have our class of Associates. Here, though we have made a good start, we have much to do. We are not satisfied by the present condition of either change. The Library should be used more and the class of Associates should be much larger. In my view, the best way to effect both aims is to link them together ; and I suggest that this can be done if we enter into closer relations with the British Records Association, and with the graduate schools in our universities. Every society and interest affiliated with the Records Association and every teacher of advanced students should know about the facilities which our Library provides. I see no insuperable obstacle in the way of a formal concordat with the Association which would make our Library a centre of its historical work. We might, for example, offer facilities in return either for a small fee or for publications. We might even reduce the qualifications and subscriptions required from Associates and confine their privileges to the use of the library and the purchase of the *Transactions* at half-price. What I want to make clear is this. When we overhauled the library and instituted the class of Associates we did not wish merely to make the former more useful to ourselves and the latter a kind of minor decoration. We wished to enter the arena, to widen our bounds and increase our usefulness as a party in the organisation throughout this country of the facilities for historical study. We shall not do this if we think that we have completed our task and that further effort, even at "the expense of our traditions," is not required. There ought to be hundreds of Associates, coming to our meetings and using our books while they are in London, as so many local workers and university graduates now frequently are. If, as the Report presented to you to-day says, the Society is " the principal organisation representing English historical scholarship," the Society must adjust itself to a changing world. I venture to commend this problem to the consideration of Council and of my successors.

The Camden Series of publications—and we should never allow ourselves to forget that we use the name of a great man who helped to open the way to the study of English history—the Camden Series, especially in these stringent days, gives an opportunity to competent scholars who desire to edit texts. Periodically our Publications Committee compiles a programme of future publications. We have some difficulty in maintaining a balance between the various periods of English history and should welcome expert advice or suggestions. As you are aware, the project of an independent series of volumes which will contain materials helpful to the student of history is now well advanced. This series, like our latest adventure, the annual bibliography of " writings in English history," is a real attempt to take a part, in a way consonant with our traditions, in the contemporary efforts to equip our historians and to save them from bewilderment as historical material grows or is made accessible. The Bibliography, which has long been needed, has been made possible by the Prothero bequest. This use of the Prothero fund, originally suggested by the Honorary Secretary, has been made effective by the prompt energy of our new officer, Mr. Milne. Indeed, the task of putting through, as well as of planning, our publications, never a light task, is becoming very heavy. How the Director, that most faithful friend and servant of the Society, Dr. Hubert Hall, manages to do all he does, is something of a mystery to me and I feel that something should be done to relieve him of part of the secretarial strain upon him. As our activities increase, as they should, the task of publishing is bound up more and more closely with the other work done by the Society. Some of our books, for example, are not presented to us from outside as finished or rather professedly finished works of art; they have to be planned and contrived within our walls, and I foresee in this direction developments which will involve closer co-operation and even more careful organisation. It is natural and right that the Council should be asked, from time to time, to co-operate with other bodies by undertaking definite tasks. The volume on chronology, to which I referred by anticipation in 1932, is in some degree due to the initiation of the British National Committee, whose duty it was to provide an English contribution to the international scheme of one of the commissions of the International Historical Committee. Recently another commission has been formed for the study of the origins and development of assemblies of estates. I cannot imagine a better centre than this Society for the execution of this task. M. Coville has asked for critical bibliographies, including information about unprinted material. The Italian scholar, Professor Leicht, wants us to study, in contemporary literature and documents, the points of view, at different periods, about the legal rights of systems of estates and their relations with the sovereign power—a demand not unlike that made last summer by Mr. H. G. Richardson in the Anglo-American Conference. M. Olivier-Martin feels that we must have a chronological study of assemblies in the formative periods—here, again, he has been anticipated by Mr. Richardson and Dr. Sayles. Now personally I feel that here is a great opportunity for co-operative study and publication which this Society might well seize. We have among our Fellows nearly all the experts in the history of Parliament. We want, and they want, to get down to and to gather together the actual texts in exactly the ways suggested by the international commission. This is the second suggestion which I venture to make, this time to the Publications Committee. It would meet new contemporary needs and opportunities, and it is in the tradition of the great statesman who sponsored the foundation of the Society.

The foregoing considerations are suggested by circumstances which this Society cannot afford to disregard. To some of us, I know, they may be repugnant, for they seem to imply a more mechanical and professional attitude to the study of history than we like to adopt. Personally, I dislike professionalism. At the same time ours is a society which has to co-operate with other societies, and so long as we do not confuse the means with the ends, the instruments with the music, we have little to fear and something to gain by deliberate attention to problems of policy or organisation. Indeed, our habits of social intercourse and meeting for the discussion of historical problems give us an advantage over other societies. We are more likely to remember the object of historical study and to give play to the impulses which cannot be defined by rules or directed by policy. Moreover, we can try to encourage a clear, simple, well-expressed presentation of historical truth with no temptation to stray from the evidence. The best answer to the cry for popular and literary history is to let people know what we are doing. The most effective way to meet the undiscriminating idea that, so long as a historical book is pleasant to read, it is as good as any other historical book, is to show, as clearly as possible, how we arrive at our conclusions, and why we think some things are right and others are wrong. In other words, those who know, or are most likely to know, should be asked to speak about their work. They cannot and should not be expected to waste their time by competing for popular favour, with all its caprices, but from such platforms as ours, they can properly be invited to explain the nature of the problems on which they are at work and either to draw conclusions or say why conclusions cannot yet be drawn. The Royal Historical Society can be the clearing-house for work of this kind, a meeting-place of scholars of all ages with those who are intelligently interested, and our *Transactions* can be the means of transmitting their contributions to the world. This does not imply that those who read papers here must have attained the age of fifty or that detailed erudition, because it is detailed, is to be banned.

It means that we should give preference to the significant, from whatever quarter it may come. A man should not be encouraged to talk about his work unless he can say why he thinks it *is* significant, in other words unless he is a historian.

In conclusion, I wish to thank the Fellows, Associates and guests of this Society, for the unfailing kindness and indulgence which they have shown to me throughout the past four years. They have been very happy years. The duty has sometimes been onerous, but the companionship never. In Council and committees we have been informal and friendly, but businesslike, and united in the pursuit of a common aim—the well-being of the Society. I have formed friendships here which, I trust, will last as long as I live.

BISMARCK AND ENGLAND IN THE EARLIER PERIOD OF HIS CAREER

By Professor V. Valentin, Ph.D.

Read 8 *October*, 1936

Queen Victoria wrote in a famous letter to her grandson William II, on June 12th 1899: "I never personally attacked or complained of Prince Bismarck, though I knew well what a bitter enemy he was to England and all the harm he did." [1] Why did Queen Victoria call Bismarck "a bitter enemy to England"? Obviously her remark was meant in a purely political sense. It was well known, as well to Queen Victoria as to anyone else in that period, that Prince Bismarck had a strong personal liking for England. He had known English and indeed had spoken the language well as a youth, not as well as he spoke French later on, but we have it from reliable witnesses that he was quite able to express himself fluently. There were times when he would hesitate, and instead of the ordinary word would find a most original and telling phrase.[2] Lord Goschen, too, has borne witness to "his racy style of speech." [3] Until he reached old age Bismarck displayed an astonishing intimacy with Shakespeare and was very fond of Walter Scott. As a young man he liked Byron and Moore; in later days he was able to quote copiously Goldsmith's *Vicar of Wakefield* in a discussion as to whether a clergyman should marry or not.[1] Bismarck even introduced some English idioms into the German—for instance: "Ehrlicher Makler" (honest broker) and: "ich werde die Nationalliberalen an die Wand drücken, dass sie quietschen" (squeeze against the wall). Bismarck was well acquainted with the English historians Carlyle, Macaulay and Lecky. As an undergraduate at Göttingen and Berlin he enjoyed the friendship of, and an exchange of languages with, the American Motley, afterwards well known as the historiographer of the Netherlands. As a young clerk at the Prussian "Regierung" at Aix-la-Chapelle, Bismarck was an acknowledged member of an otherwise strictly English circle.

---

[1] *Queen Victoria, the Letters*, Third Series, vol. III, pp. 381–2; the thesis: Eva Maria Baum, *Bismarcks Urteil über England und die Engländer*, München, 1936, is an industrious but rather trivial study, unfortunately spoiled by many elementary mistakes.

[2] Bismarck, *Die Gesammelten Werke*, IX, p. 353 (*Urteil des amerikanischen Journalisten* G. W. Smalley, 1893).

[3] A. D. Elliot, *Life of G. J. Goschen*, I, p. 211.

He had a mild flirtation with the niece of an English duke and, later on, was formally engaged for several months to the daughter of an English clergyman.[2] Bismarck's knowledge of the English country itself was only superficial. He visited England but twice, in 1842 and 1862, the first time for some weeks, the second time only for about a fortnight. He shared with many Germans of his social class an affection for English country life and the English gentry. He admired English institutions, especially in his younger days, but always emphasised the fact that English institutions were an individual growth and were on the whole too English to be transplanted to any other country, especially to Prussia and Germany. It would be quite correct to say that Bismarck had no personal prejudices against England. His personal feelings were, on the contrary, rather favourable. He never understood modern democratic and radical England, the country of Gladstone and Joseph Chamberlain; he thoroughly disapproved of the methods of Cecil Rhodes. But he called Disraeli his friend, and treated Lord Salisbury as a statesman with great respect.

Why, then, did Queen Victoria call him England's bitter enemy? It is well known that in the later period of his career—falling after the Franco-German War—Bismarck's keenest aim was to win England as an ally. There are three serious proposals, in 1876, 1879, and 1887—there are periods in which a certain rapprochement is attained and periods again of coldness. The sole and somewhat poor result of all this was the agreement made in 1887 between England, Italy, and Austria-Hungary on Mediterranean and Balkan questions. I do not wish to discuss here the motives underlying English policy—but I just wish to state the fact that Bismarck needed English friendship because France now definitely stood out as Germany's foe and Russia's attitude was becoming more and more doubtful.

---

[1] Bismarck, *Die Gesammelten Werke*, VIII, p. 534.

[2] Erich Marcks, *Bismarck*, I, S. 140. The remarks of Eva Maria Baum on the affair are erroneous.

Why did Queen Victoria call Bismarck England's bitter enemy ? There must be definite reasons, and I tried to find them from the earlier period of Bismarck's career. I have studied all the reports of English diplomats from the major German " Residenzen " during the period 1848–71. The greater part of this valuable material had not yet been used for scholarly work. I hope to be enabled by these studies to give an answer to my question.

Bismarck's first contact with English diplomacy occurred at Frankfurt, where Bismarck lived as Prussian minister to the Diet (1852–9). His English colleague was Sir Alexander Malet (1800–86), whose picture, familiar to scholars through Bismarck's dispatches from Frankfurt, requires more details to complete it. Malet was of a very quiet and patient disposition. Both his grandfathers had been Anglican clergy. He was extremely sincere, and in conjunction with his natural reserve a shrewd and an acute observer. A confidential relationship was soon established between Malet and Bismarck, which for some time bore the marks of real friendship. Malet felt himself strongly attracted by Bismarck's candid and decisive manner and formed a striking judgment on the qualities of his young colleague ; although the joy which Bismarck took in passing hyperbolical opinions on people—hyperboles calculated to give offence—and the audacity with which he dealt with affairs would naturally not meet with the approval of a man of so scrupulous and puritanical a nature as Sir Alexander. Bismarck's bold way of expressing himself afforded Malet so much pleasure that he frequently quoted the Prussian minister verbatim in his dispatches.

There were four incidents of note, four clashes between Bismarck and English foreign policy before he became Prime minister of Prussia. Three incidents occurred at Frankfurt, the fourth and last at St. Petersburg. All these episodes, more or less trifles against the background of the main historical development, are only of importance because London built up a certain opinion of Bismarck on them. The little that is known of these matters comes only from German sources. Since these incidents belong to English diplomatic history as well as to German diplomatic history, I found it necessary to compare my new English sources with the knowledge extant and so to form a definite scientific opinion.

The first two incidents concern the Crimean War. In the summer of 1853 English diplomacy endeavoured to draw Austria and Prussia on to the side of the Western powers. This attempt succeeded tolerably well with Austria, but had no success whatever with Prussia. It is not generally known that at first matters were of a very different colour. Prussia's attitude as expressed by the Prussian Foreign minister, Freiherr O. v. Manteuffel, in June 1853, could only serve as an encouragement to England and France to proceed in a rigorous manner against Russia. But later on Prussia preferred neutrality. English diplomacy was unable to hide its disappointment and remained always of the opinion that Prussia's behaviour was directly responsible for hastening the outbreak and for ruining the result of the Crimean War. There was constant violent debate about the part Prussia should play in the Eastern question, and the most passionate champion of the Russian friendship was Bismarck at Frankfurt. Many times Manteuffel hesitated and made proposals which would have been very welcome to England. Time after time it was Bismarck who hindered the adoption of such proposals by his influence at court. Lord Bloomfield, the English minister in Berlin, became more and more angry about the activities of the young diplomat. When Manteuffel in the Spring of 1854 tendered his resignation to the king, the court party brought its whole influence to bear on having Bismarck made Foreign minister with a programme of open breach with the Western powers. Lord Bloomfield wrote at this time about Bismarck on March 3rd, 1854:

> He is a favourite of the king and not without talent, but inexperienced and knowing little beyond the affairs of Germany. If he succeeded to Baron Manteuffel's office he would probably become the mere tool of the king and the Kreuzzeitung party. . . .[1]

At the same time Bismarck gave Sir Alexander Malet a comprehensive account of the political situation. His version differed sharply from that which was familiar to English diplomacy—especially through Lord Bloomfield's reports. The Foreign secretary, Lord Clarendon, regarded Bismarck's achievement as so important that he remarked upon it in a special instruction to Sir Alexander and in addition transmitted the report to Lord Bloomfield for his counter-observations. The most striking points were Bismarck's mention of English "menaces" and his confession to the idea of strict neutrality as his permanent conviction of the most useful Prussian policy. Lord Clarendon emphasised that the British Government had in various official documents disclaimed not only any right but even the intention of adopting a threatening tone. His instruction concludes:

> . . . M. de Bismarck may be assured that Her Majesty's Government have too much respect for the independence of Prussia and are too desirous of seeing her occupy the position in Germany she is entitled to hold, to have used language towards

---

[1] Lord Bloomfield's dispatch, Berlin, 11th March 1854. F.O. Prussia, Public Record Office.

her which they would have resented if addressed to this country.[1]

Lord Bloomfield, of course, protested most energetically against the account and interpretation given by Bismarck. "Bismarck's views," he wrote, "differ from the impressions which prevail here and are inconsistent with the real facts." The character of the parties in Berlin was always correctly described to the English foreign secretary by his minister: it was impossible to deny the existence of a Russian party in Berlin; Bismarck himself, when in Berlin, was a regular guest of the Russian minister, but the great mass of the nation and of the army, especially the population of the Rhineland, was completely anti-Russian. Lord Bloomfield stated that he had never used threats towards the Prussian Government. With bitterness he mentioned the hesitation of the Berlin Government, the idle gossip of political intriguers, the malicious expressions of opinion by unscrupulous partisans. And now Lord Bloomfield aimed a particularly telling blow at Bismarck, for he related how, before Bismarck's arrival, Manteuffel had read aloud to him a private letter from Bismarck addressed to himself so as to show the English minister how wrong Bismarck's opinions were. It contained these words: "But the moment had arrived for establishing Prussia's supremacy in Germany and that Prussia should now ally herself with Russia to attain this aim." During his last visit to Berlin, Bismarck had first realised the impossibility of an alliance with Russia and had turned therefore towards a policy of strict neutrality. Lord Bloomfield clearly showed in his dispatch his intense vexation at Bismarck's conduct. Bismarck desired complete equality at the Diet, for he wanted to have as big a chair to sit on as the Austrian Presiding minister; evidently Bismarck was unaware that outbursts of passion and indignation were unusual in the official dealings of British diplomats, although Prussian ministers on such occasions most certainly often forgot themselves. Bismarck's conversation with Sir Alexander Malet in Frankfurt had aimed, according to Lord Bloomfield, at creating a more favourable impression about his political views in the mind of the English Government than had been the case in Berlin ; his ambition had been and would be to become Prime minister and therefore he had made use of an opportunity to gain the good will of Her Majesty's Government :

---

[1] Sir A. Malet to the Earl of Clarendon, Frankfurt, 29 March 1854. F.O. Germany. Earl of Clarendon to Sir Alexander Malet, London, 8 April 1854, F.O. Germany, P.R.O.

> For my own part I candidly confess that should events call him to the head of the Government in Prussia I should regard his accession to power as a complete triumph of the Kreuzzeitung party and the successful result of Russian intrigues.[1]

Sir Alexander Malet was now faced with the somewhat delicate task of informing Bismarck of the differing opinions of Lord Clarendon and Lord Bloomfield. Bismarck admitted that the account of the threatening language ascribed to foreign diplomats in Berlin had very likely been an embroidered one and exaggerated by certain party leaders in Prussia. Sir Alexander found himself in an especially painful position because he was instructed further to make suitable use of Lord Bloomfield's dispatch, containing that quotation of Bismarck's private letter which was proved to be in sharp contradiction with his official utterances at Frankfurt. Sir Alexander wrote to London that it was certainly not the intention of Lord Clarendon to bring about a breach with Bismarck, but that this would be the result were he to charge him with insincerity ; such a reproach would be implied if Bismarck were taxed with those phrases of his private letter used by Manteuffel verbatim in conversation with Lord Bloomfield. Malet declared that he regarded it as his business not only to follow official instructions but also to maintain friendly relations with Bismarck. The aim of his conversation with Bismarck was to extract from him all the valuable information that was possible. His principles, wrote Sir Alexander, bear a very strong resemblance to those of the English Cavaliers and Scottish Jacobites ; Bismarck presented the unusual spectacle of a man possessing the confidence of his king, but enjoying the support of not a single member of the ministry.[1] With considerable skill Sir Alexander smoothed the situation, and cultivated good personal relations with Bismarck, even when, in accordance with the international situation, he prepared a new drive of English diplomatic activity in Germany—friendship with Austria and the minor states, a struggle against Prussian neutrality.

---

[1] Lord Bloomfield to the Earl of Clarendon, 8 April 1854, Berlin, F.O. Germany.

The great victories of the Western powers near Sebastopol did not make Prussia's position any easier. Again and again the King of Prussia tried to remain in friendly touch with the Western powers. One of his attempts was the mission of Freiherr von Usedom to London in February 1855. This mission produced the cause of the next incident in Bismarck's relations to England. Prussia was at this very moment deeply offended with the great powers who had punished her for her conduct by not inviting her to the international conference in Vienna. A sudden Prussian military attack would have endangered Austria very seriously ; the Rhine frontier could easily have been held by Prussia, even were the territory on the left bank occupied by France. At this moment of international tension the new clash occurred at Frankfurt. On February 22nd, 1855, the Austrian Presiding Minister, Freiherr von Prokesch, imparted to Sir Alexander Malet an information of importance just handed over by Bismarck. According to Bismarck the Cabinet in Berlin had received from Freiherr von Usedom in London the intelligence that "there need be no fear that England would ever participate in any hostility against Prussia." Malet told Prokesch to deny Bismarck's remark sharply ; England was definitely prepared to fulfil all her military duties as an ally against any European power. Lord Clarendon too sent dispatches at once to Sir Alexander, saying that Usedom's statement had no foundation whatever. Malet in consequence remonstrated with Bismarck and asked him two very direct questions: firstly, whether he was acquainted with Usedom's dispatch, and secondly, whether he had ever, in the course of conversation, turned to account the statement made by Usedom that England would never take hostile measures against Prussia even in the case of a war between Prussia and the other allied powers, Austria and France. Bismarck did not return a direct answer to these questions, he went off to another subject, and when brought back to the point his answer was still indirect and, as Sir Alexander writes, "embarrassed." The English minister received the impression that Bismarck had actually made the remark in question but was indisposed to admit this to Sir Alexander.

---

[1] Sir Alexander Malet to the Earl of Clarendon, Frankfurt, 29 April, 1854, F.O. Germany.

The question which had given rise to this diplomatic incident concerned the fortresses of the German Confederation. It was discussed at the Diet by Bismarck without instructions from Berlin. The general impression was that while dealing with a necessary part of the federal military problems Bismarck had managed to make a pointed declaration against France. The Western powers prepared revenge. Lord Bloomfield especially took great personal satisfaction in complaining about Bismarck. Bismarck received a reprimand from Manteuffel. At least Manteuffel told the English minister that he had written to Bismarck in the name of the king. Such steps of Bismarck as were dictated by a hostile spirit towards the Western powers were not approved. Manteuffel asserted that he had further addressed a circular to all Prussian diplomatic representatives in which it was stated that Bismarck had acted without instructions and that the king disapproved of his conduct. Lord Bloomfield replied in a somewhat defiant tone that he hoped this reproof would not only teach M. de Bismarck a good lesson, but that other Prussian diplomats would also profit by it. This remark presumably spoilt the whole affair. The British minister was not a little surprised to learn a short time afterwards that the reprimand had not been sent to Bismarck in the form described to him and to his French colleague by Manteuffel. The official Prussian "Korrespondenz" stated: "Herr von Bismarck has been neither disavowed nor dropped. Foreign powers have no right to interfere in the debates of the Diet which concern German internal affairs." This phrase might have been coined by Bismarck himself. At the next interview with Manteuffel Lord Bloomfield enjoyed the curious experience of finding that the Prussian foreign minister seemed to have forgotten everything he had said a fortnight ago. Manteuffel now pointed out that it was impossible to disapprove of words which had never been uttered; had Bismarck acted in the way ascribed to him, then he would have been disavowed. Lord Bloomfield could not obtain any further explanation. The incident closed with bad blood on both sides, especially on the part of Lord Bloomfield and Sir Alexander Malet. It was obvious that Bismarck played an extraordinary part in Prussian policy and was protected as a sort of *enfant gâté* by secret powers.[1]

Bismarck's last clash with the English minister in Frankfurt occurred two years later. In the meantime a Franco-Prussian rapprochement kept pace with the stretching of the tension between England and Prussia. An Anglo-Austrian friendship was formed as a consequence of the rôle which Austria had played in the Crimean War; one reason more for Bismarck to stress his suspicions of England. The incident of 1857 was provoked by the Bentinck case. The English major-general Sir Henry Bentinck, descendant of the counts of the Roman Empire von Bentinck, demanded from the Grand-Duke of Oldenburg the restitution of the former titular domain of Kniphausen. As a British subject he was legally entitled, according to the " Schlussakte " of Vienna, to present his claim before the German Confederation through the diplomatic representative of his country. In addition he addressed himself directly to the King of Prussia. Sir Henry's legal adviser asked Lord Bloomfield whether or not the support of the Prussian Government could be obtained for his client's petition in Frankfurt. After repeated consultations with Manteuffel, Lord Bloomfield could only reply that at present nothing more than a certain measure of goodwill could be expected and that Bismarck's opinion was that the case ought to be decided by Court of Law and not by the Diet. It hurt Bismarck's national pride that such an affair could be settled by diplomatic methods. Manteuffel took no action with the government of Oldenburg, but discussed the subject with Bismarck, when in Berlin, and recommended it to his attention. Under these somewhat discouraging conditions Bentinck's petition was presented at the Diet and debated there in November 1857. Sir Alexander Malet was not in Frankfurt on the day of the debate ; he only returned from England in January. A few days before his departure he met Bismarck, while out riding, and the English minister said he would present the petition. Bismarck replied that he had no instructions whatever in the affair. Malet visited Bismarck twice after that with the note in his pocket in order to advise him confidentially of its contents, but did not find him at home. He showed the note then to the ministers of Mecklenburg and Bavaria. It is therefore incorrect to say that the English minister had neglected to inform Bismarck in time. At the session of the Diet on November 26 only Sir Alexander's deputy, Mr. Edwardes, was present as British Chargé d'affaires. The attitude taken up by Bismarck during this session struck all the other participants as being an unforeseen and violent attack not only on England but also on Austria. Obviously Bismarck used the Bentinck affair as a pretext to assert his old claim to equality of rank against Austria and to criticise the management of business by the Presiding Minister, now Count Rechberg. Sir Alexander Malet, once back at Frankfurt, was informed of the incident by a member of the Diet, not Count Rechberg, but probably the minister of the Netherlands. He reported to his government; Lord Clarendon took the matter somewhat seriously and requested Lord Bloomfield once again to complain about Bismarck. "Bismarck," the instruction asserted, "had protested against the interference of a foreign power in German affairs and had moreover used unfriendly expressions against England." The British Government had taken notice of such behaviour with no small surprise, especially after the assurances given by the King of Prussia to Sir Henry Bentinck and those given by Baron Manteuffel to the English minister. After such assurances it was not expected that the Prussian minister to the Diet would adopt such a "hostile and unreasonable course." Lord Bloomfield discussed the affair with Manteuffel, who, taking up the same line of defence as Bismarck, upheld the position that a formal mistake had been made by Sir Alexander; he should have communicated the petition to Bismarck before the session. Lord Bloomfield maintained that Sir Alexander had made no mistake at all and that it was impossible to make the English minister responsible for the fact that Count Rechberg had omitted to inform his Prussian colleague about the petition in time; in any case, Bismarck's behaviour demanded further explanations. Manteuffel merely replied that he was personally very sorry that Bismarck's way of proceeding had given rise to a disagreeable correspondence with the British Government, but, to do Bismarck justice, he declared that the affair should not be interpreted as a hostile act against England, but rather as an incident arising out of a misunderstanding between Austria and Prussia, born of the jealous strife existing at the Diet in Frankfurt. The unpleasant affair was settled by respective declarations of loyalty tendered by the partners. Sir Alexander Malet and Bismarck exchanged letters on the incident; they were unknown till to-day and are the prime source of my account. Before the return of Sir Alexander, Bismarck took the opportunity of stating his opinion to the English chargé d'affaires Edwardes. One or two lines of Mr. Edwardes' report may be quoted:

---

[1] Sir Alexander Malet's dispatches, Frankfurt, 24 Jan. 23 Feb., 2 and 30 March 1855, F.O. Germany; Lord Bloomfield's dispatches, Berlin, 2, 12, 22 March 1855, F.O. Prussia.

> M. de Bismarck then ended by requesting me to assure your Lordship that there was no greater mistake than to suppose that he was animated by any hostile feeling towards England. It is true that during the Russian war his policy differed from ours, but that he, perhaps more than any other person in his country, was an admirer of England and of her institutions, and that all his habits and all his tastes were English.[1]

Lord Clarendon was satisfied with this explanation given by Bismarck and thanked him and also Count Rechberg, who had expressed his regret over the incident and the indiscretion. Lord Clarendon now instructed Sir Alexander Malet to do direct official business not only with the Austrian Presiding minister of the Diet but with the other ministers too. If Sir Alexander were allowed to do so before, he could have *sent* the English note to Bismarck and would not have kept it in his pocket. Lord Bloomfield stated, concerning Bismarck's explanation, that Bismarck was not regarded in Prussia as someone filled with goodwill towards England; for some years Bismarck had been working for a close alliance with Russia and France against England and Austria; his English habits and feelings were not dictated by love of constitutional liberty, but arose from his taste for drinking, carousals and sport.

Lord Bloomfield was, at least, right on one score. The unsettled condition of Anglo-Prussian relations was treated by Bismarck as being of relatively minor importance. It would have suited him very well to have England withdraw from continental affairs, above all with regard to Schleswig-Holstein. The rôle played by English diplomacy in Berlin had wounded his Prussian nationalism and he reacted accordingly. Of the Anglo-Austrian friendship Bismarck did not take a tragic view, for he did not expect that Great Britain would show an active interest in preserving Austria's position in Italy and Germany. The idea of an Anglo-Prussian Alliance was emphatically rejected by Bismarck in his famous report of April 26th, 1856, called the "Prachtbericht." The Government of the "Neue Aera" in Prussia, being moderately liberal and inclining to a rapprochement with England and Austria, could not possibly approve of Bismarck's ideas and sent him as Prussian minister to St. Petersburg. It was intended as and understood by all experts as a dignified exile for the champion of Russia.

---

[1] Lord Bloomfield's dispatches, Berlin, 7 Nov., 12, 17 Nov., 5 Dec. 1857, 14 Jan. 1858, F.O. Prussia; Earl of Clarendon's instructions, London, 2 Dec., 9 Dec. 1857, 6 Jan. 1858, F.O. Prussia; Mr. Edwardes' dispatch, Frankfurt, 31 Dec. 1857, F.O. Germany; private letter of Sir Alexander Malet to Bismarck, Frankfurt, 28 Jan. 1858; Bismarck's answer, Frankfurt, 31 Jan. 1858. Printed sources: *Preussen am Bundestage*, III, 174, f. 189 f, 196, 220; H. von Poschinger, *Bismarck und der Bundestag*, p. 283; O. von Bismarck, *Die Gesammelten Werke*, II, pp. 266 ff.; A. O. Meyer, *Bismarcks Kampf mit Oesterreich*, p. 377.

Sir Alexander Malet wrote as a sort of farewell on Bismarck:

> I have always maintained that whatever party may be in power in Prussia, the personal character and remarkable energy of M. de Bismarck will carry their own weight and hardly fail to ensure to his opinions a prospect of success.[1]

Bismarck's fourth and last clash with England occurred just at the beginning of his Petersburg period. The Franco-Austrian War of 1859 was accompanied by remarkable fresh international tension. England and Prussia at first worked together with the object of upholding the Viennese treaties of 1815. France tried to help Italy to become a national state and was, curiously enough, helped in this objective by Russia, who was only too glad to foster Austria's humiliation. The decisive question was whether England and Prussia would make up their minds or not to defend the treaties of Vienna by arms. The British Foreign Office was not willing to protect these treaties against any violation. The Earl of Malmesbury, then Foreign secretary, addressed a circular dispatch on May 2nd, 1859, to the Courts of Germany which were anxious to help Austria, in some way informing them that there was no reason to expect active help from Great Britain in case of war between the German states and France. Transgressing his instruction, Lord Bloomfield gave a copy of this dispatch to the Prussian Foreign minister von Schleinitz. Schleinitz sent the copy to Bismarck in strictest confidence, for personal perusal only. Bismarck however struck a sharp blow against England by showing the copy to Prince Gortschakoff, the Russian Foreign minister. Gortschakoff was now able to quote English official authority for the Russian opinion that there was no urgent reason to abandon the position of neutrality, that the violation of the Viennese treaties was no *casus belli* for the great powers, that all peace treaties might be modified by new political facts, by national or revolutionary movements. The English ministers were deeply shocked by Bismarck's daring chess move—he made some vague statement about his own behaviour. Lord Bloomfield had to apologise for his indiscretion and Lord Malmesbury wrote him :

---

[1] Sir Alexander Malet's dispatch, Frankfurt, 15 Jan. 1859, F.O. Germany.

> Her Majesty's Government cannot regard as otherwise than unsatisfactory the reasons alleged by M. de Bismarck for communicating the dispatch to the Russian minister, and indeed they consider this proceeding to be quite inexcusable as M. de Bismarck must have been perfectly well aware that the line of policy adopted by Russia in the present crisis differs essentially from that of Great Britain and Prussia.[1]

It will be easily understood after all this that the English Government did not feel very warmly about Bismarck as nominee for the Prussian ministry for foreign affairs. In spring 1860 Baron Schleinitz was prepared to resign, and

---

[1] Earl of Malmesbury to Lord Bloomfield, London, 8 June 1859; Lord Bloomfield's dispatches, Berlin, 11 and 30 May 1859, F.O. Prussia; *Die Politische Berichte des Fürsten Bismarck aus Petersburg und Paris*, I, pp. 58, 85, 90; Bismarck, *Die Gesammelten Werke*, III, p. 40.

Bismarck's succession was again seriously put on the carpet. At this very moment Bismarck astonished his old foe Lord Bloomfield by a remarkable modification of his opinions. Bismarck, the champion of conservative loyalty, the supporter of Prussia's alliance with the autocratic empires Russia and France, "stressed now upon the necessity of Prussia nailing her colours to a national policy," this time of course a German national policy. Lord Bloomfield writes further: "Bismarck has moreover expressed himself as fully sensible to the advantages of an English alliance." This is the first time in Bismarck's career that he has shown any inclination to a rapprochement with England. Lord Bloomfield remarks maliciously that it would be difficult to express a correct opinion as to how far Bismarck has been influenced by his wish to recommend himself to the Prince Regent, later King William I.[1]

Anyhow, the result of the four clashes between Bismarck and English diplomats could not be eradicated. Bismarck's portrait was fixed: a very able man, the coming man in Prussia, in no way the type of a correct and conventional diplomat, a bold, brilliant but unscrupulous personality, perhaps a great man—in any case no political friend to England.

Foreigners find it a characteristic of the English that they cannot forget first impressions. First impressions are decisive in forming an opinion on men, later impressions are considered less important, and if later impressions do not harmonise with first impressions the man in question becomes suspect. Such was Bismarck's case. In spring 1862, Bismarck was called back from St. Petersburg. The question arose as to whether he should at once become a member of the Prussian Cabinet, probably for home affairs, or whether he should go as an ambassador to London. Count Bernstorff, then Prussian minister for foreign affairs, had reserved for himself the embassy in London or in Paris, with a slight preference for Paris. Bismarck himself wished to go to

---

[1] Lord Bloomfield's dispatch, Berlin, 28 May 1860, F.O. Prussia.

London and said this to everybody in St. Petersburg. He told Lord Loftus, then British minister in Berlin, London would give him the opportunity, "pour achever son éducation politique." Bismarck's real reason was certainly that his political friendship with the Emperor Napoleon III was quite close enough, and he did not want the full glare of publicity turned on their relationship. Lord Palmerston warned the French Government to accept Bismarck as ambassador in Paris and affected by this manœuvre, perhaps intentionally, that Bismarck was indeed sent to Paris—*par dépit*! The English Government had certainly not refused in any form to have Bismarck, but had not shown any warmth about having him. Bismarck's feelings for Palmerston and England could not be improved by such an incident.[1]

It is not too well known that King William intended at first to keep Count Bernstorff as minister for foreign affairs when Bismarck in autumn 1862 finally did form his famous Cabinet. The old king needed Bismarck for home consumption, as battering-ram against the liberal majority in the Chamber of Deputies. But he was very suspicious of Bismarck's francophile, bonapartistic complexion in foreign affairs. But William I had to give way. Our great German statesman's classic period began, in Foreign policy as well as in home policy. Prussia's, Germany's, Europe's new form was moulded by the will of one man.

Bismarck was not a "bitter enemy to England," as Queen Victoria suggested in her famous letter with the pardonable exaggeration of an old woman sovereign, who saw historic facts over-simplified through the glass of time.[2]

---

[1] Lord A. Loftus' dispatch, Berlin, 15 March, F.O. Prussia; Lord A. Loftus, *Diplomatic Reminiscences*, First Series, vol. II, p. 230; K. Ringhoffer, *Im Kampf um Preussens Ehre* (Graf A. Bernstorff), p. 505.

[2] As Professor Webster suggested in the discussion, Queen Victoria used to identify England with the house of Coburg; Bismarck, indeed, was no friend of the Coburg family and its European influence; cp. many new letters of the Queen in *Queen Victoria—ein Frauenleben*, ed. K. Jagow, Berlin, 1936.

Bismarck never was the fool of principles, he never was led by dogma. He drew of course all the consequences from his apparently so extravagant political opinions during the Crimean War. The friendship with Russia, strengthened by thorny experiences during the Polish rebellion in 1863, enabled him to find a very profitable solution of the Schleswig-Holstein question and to vanquish Austria and many minor German states in 1866: Bismarck's other great friendship with the Emperor of the French, continually revived by vague promises, was dealt a death-blow by the Luxemburg crisis in 1867. At the very moment France became the definite enemy, Bismarck began preparing his first rapprochement with England. In 1864 he had been quite willing to risk a breach with Great Britain who could not act without France. Bismarck's policy in 1865–6 defied English sympathy for Austria, again and again. After 1867 he co-operated in a friendly way with England in the Eastern and in the Roman question. He even hoped to draw England over to North Germany's side and thus encircle Napoleon III. Had it been possible to seduce the French emperor to a compromising attack on Belgium, had it been possible to plant the Prince of Hohenzollern at France's south-western frontier—then Bismarck's North German Confederation, always backed by the Russian friend, would have won some allies for a war with France. These calculations failed. The Franco-German War was localised, just as were Bismarck's previous wars, not least through the very valuable and keen efforts of English diplomacy.

THE MANNING OF THE NAVY IN THE WEST INDIES, 1702–63 [1]

BY R. PARES, M.A., F.R.HIST.S.

Read 10 *December*, 1936

THE manning of the navy in the West Indies presented a great administrative difficulty to the English and French Governments in the eighteenth century, and brought them into conflict with several important interests. These conflicts are worth examination, because they throw light upon the problems which arose when the claims of war and business had to be adjusted to each other.

The naval squadrons, the privateers, and the merchantmen in the West Indies were all sure to lose a great number of men, not so much to the enemy as to rum and the climate. These adversaries made their most violent attacks in the first months, but they seem to have continued their work steadily after the first paroxysm. The losses which resulted from these causes could not easily be made up, for neither the shipping nor the plantations afforded a large reserve of white men able and willing to go to sea. The French privateers overcame the difficulty by employing free negroes and even slaves; but if we may judge by the remarks of Governors and Admirals, this practice was not common among the English privateers and almost unheard-of in the Royal Navy.[1]

---

[1] In the footnotes to this paper I propose to use the following abbreviations:

Add. MSS. = British Museum, Additional Manuscripts.
Adm. = Public Record Office, Admiralty Papers.
A.N. = Archives Nationales, Paris.
C.O. = Public Record Office, Colonial Office Papers.
C.S.P. Col. = *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial.*
S.P. = Public Record Office, State Papers.

The merchant shipping from Europe was reputed to need more hands on the return than on the outward voyage, because it came out half-loaded and went home with a full freight in a good or normal year. Besides, some ships carried out a few servants or emigrants, who might help in the work on board ; no assistance of the kind was to be had on the voyage home. On the other hand, the slave traders nearly always had some hands to discharge in the West Indies, because they did not need nearly so large a crew to carry home a cargo of sugar as for supervising and controlling the slaves in the Middle Passage.[1] Whether the slave traders' surplus equalled the deficit of the other sugar-ships, there is no means of telling for this period; nor can we know what relation either figure bore to the ordinary mortality of seamen in the West Indies. But it appears from certain complaints of the merchants that there was sometimes a great shortage of hands, even in time of peace.

---

[1] Admiral Frankland condemned the use of the " woolly race " in vessels of war, and wished to discourage it by selling all negroes, free or slave, found on board French privateers. Governor Thomas would not allow this, probably because the negroes on the English privateers would be treated in the same way (Frankland to Clevland, 28 April, 1757, and his reply to charges, 20 July, Adm. 1/306). The English must therefore have employed some negroes, especially at Jamaica ; indeed, the *Dowdall* privateer of Jamaica had fifteen negroes in her crew, and the *Queen Anne* had twenty. The owners themselves lamented the necessity of filling up their crews in this manner, and ascribed it to Admiral Davers' press-gang, which took up all their white sailors (Second petition of the Manning party, 28 Nov., 1745, with annexed affidavit of Curtin, C.O. 137/57 ; Trelawny to Lords of the Admiralty, 21 Dec., 1743, Adm. 1/3817). However, we may infer from the general tone of surprise and disapproval that negroes were seldom enlisted in the crews of English privateers. Governor Robinson of Barbados expressly said so, and argued from it that the English would lose rather than gain by an agreement to exchange free negroes taken in privateers (Robinson, answers to queries, 20 Feb., 1746/7, C.O. 28/46). This is what might be expected, for there were fewer free negroes in the English islands than in the French, and the owners of valuable slaves would hardly expose them to capture at sea when they could employ them profitably on land. The fate of free negroes taken in arms at sea was very hard. Sometimes the colonial authorities agreed to respect their freedom if it could be lawfully proved ; Trelawny and Larnage made such an arrangement in 1746 (Larnage to Maurepas, 13 March, 1746, A.N. Colonies, C^{9}A 68). But the English courts obstructed this humane disposition. John Hudson Guy, Chief Justice of Jamaica, declared that a letter of a Spanish Governor was not enough to prove the freedom of a negro. The Vice-Admiralty Court of New York invented another way to produce the same result. It accepted the Governor of Havana's certificate, but decided that the English purchasers had bought the prisoners in good faith and ought not to suffer by the mistake ; therefore the negroes were not to have their freedom until the purchase-money had been refunded, presumably by themselves (C. M. Hough, *Reports of Cases in the Vice-Admiralty of the Province of*

War increased the competition, by adding a number of privateers to the bidders for seamen. Not all the privateers who cruised in the West Indies fitted out there, and even those who did so might draw some of their men from other parts of the world; for instance, many of the privateersmen of Martinique were non-resident. Yet there must have been some additional demand for men in the islands themselves; moreover, the royal squadrons in the West Indies were always strengthened during a war, and their needs were proportionably increased.

Desertion and inveigling were therefore very prevalent. In the French islands, the captains of vessels whose crews were reduced by mortality suborned the sailors of other vessels by excessive wages, which they paid in advance. Those whose crews were inveigled in this way were forced in their turn to seduce the crews of yet others. The captains

New York, pp. 29–31). A grotesque example of the arguments employed in court against the negroes' freedom is to be found in the speech of Peter Vezian, quartermaster of the *Revenge* privateer, at New Providence. This speech may indeed be a mere literary composition invented or half-remembered after the event (J. F. Jameson, *Privateering and Piracy in the Colonial Period*, N.Y., 1923, pp. 407–10). Some Governors refused to make any arrangements for exchanging prisoners of this colour, fearing to be imposed upon by certificates of freedom falsely obtained from the enemy's authorities. Even where the Governors and courts agreed to respect the freedom of negroes and mulattoes, they had still to reckon with the Admirals. Frankland took the law into his own hands so far as he could, by selling as slaves all the free negroes taken by the ships under his command. Commodore Douglas followed his example, and told the Governor of Martinique that he could treat English negroes in the same way.

[1] Trelawny to the Lords of the Admiralty, 21 Dec., 1743, Adm. 1/3817; Holmes to Pitt, 29 Oct., 1761, Adm. 1/236.

could not well help themselves; some people thought the sailors more worthy of punishment, for they exacted five or six times their ordinary wages for the run home. There was an order of 1721, for annulling such bargains with deserters; but the sailors always made their new captains engage to indemnify them against it. Complaints of the same kind abounded in the English colonies. The seamen sometimes asked and obtained as much as forty pounds for the run home. They were commonly encouraged and concealed by the innkeepers, who were sometimes accused of "working up" the seamen's demands "for their obtaining the payment of the large scores, they have debauched them into the expence of," or keeping the seamen hidden "in order to make great and unreasonable profit of them." These landlords played, no doubt, into the hands of those merchants who were ready to pay for it, like those of Cork, of whom it was said: "The merchants encourage the landlords to trust and keep them ready till they are wanted for privateers or merchant ships, when those who want them pay the debt which they have contracted and have security for their proceeding the voyage." [1]

Governor Trelawny of Jamaica, in one of his quarrels with Admirals, asserted that the press-gang itself was the cause of all these nuisances. That was not quite true, as we can see from the peace-time legislation of the colonies. Some masters of merchant ships at St. Kitts petitioned the Governor in 1735 for a law to prevent the keepers of punch-houses from harbouring their seamen and inducing them to desert. An Act of Antigua, made in 1739, recited that the traders had lately suffered from the desertion of their sailors and the extravagant demands of those whom they were forced to hire in the deserters' room. It prohibited the payment of any lump sum or gratuity for the run home, and imposed penalties on innkeepers who kept sailors on their premises after eight o'clock at night, and on masters of vessels who took them into service without a certificate of discharge from their last ship. The legislature of Barbados passed a very similar Act in 1754. Both these laws, made in time of peace for the benefit of the masters of trading ships, contain provisions for search warrants and for compelling the seamen to take service, which the naval commanders-in-chief might well have envied.[1]

---

[1] Samson to Maurepas, 15 May, 1745, A.N. Colonies, C^9A 67; Vernon to Trelawny, 24 May, 1740, S.P. 42/85; Preamble to the Barbados Act of 30 Oct., 1754, C.O. 30/10; *Tomlinson Papers* (Navy Records Society, 1936), pp. 185–6.

Where their own squadrons did not demand too much, those commanders might well have co-operated with the merchants in rounding up seamen. Admiral Vernon actually did so, before he broke with Trelawny. He felt for the merchants of whom the seamen demanded extravagant wages, and suggested that if the civil power were "exerted with vigour in taking up all the idle seamen on shore at once, and delivering them into his Majesty's service," he would "take care the merchant shall be assisted with them at reasonable terms, or find those to spare them in their rooms that will be glad to do so." This scheme was executed. At the Leeward Islands, Captain Holburne performed a curious service to a merchant captain who had been obliged to promise excessive wages for the run home. He used his authority to annul the bargain by having the men pressed into his own ship, and lending some of his own crew instead. The aggrieved sailors, however, threatened to go to court, and the owners' representatives thought it prudent to pay them their full hire.[2] So long as there were enough seamen to go round, the merchants could only gain by such alliances with the navy, which would lower wages artificially. In the French ports, if we may judge by the records of Bordeaux, the ship-owners relied greatly upon the interposition of the *Commissaires des classes*, to force the seamen to take less wages than they asked, presumably by threatening to draft them into the King's service if they held out.[1] That kind of arrangement was only possible where the State had an absolute claim to the service of the whole sea-faring population. The Government might be held to have such a claim in England, but was in process of losing it in this period, particularly in the colonies.

---

[1] St. Kitts Council Minutes, 29 May, 1735 (St. Kitts Administrator's Office); Antigua Act of 1739, C.O. 8/7; Barbados Act of 30 Oct., 1754, C.O. 30/10.

[2] Lascelles and Maxwell to the owners of the *Royal Captive*, 24 Oct., 1746, Letter-Books of Messrs. Wilkinson and Gaviller, Vol. III.

We cannot enter here into a general discussion of the press-gang; but we must notice its operation during these wars, and the way in which the colonies came to be exempted from it.[2]

Why had the navy to rely on the press-gang at all? Because it offered less rewards than the privateers and imposed more hardship than the merchant service. Wages naturally rose on the outbreak of war. The Government made some attempt to keep pace with this rise by increasing the bounties to volunteers. It allowed the privateers and merchants to employ a high proportion of neutral sailors in their crews.[3] At the same time it tried to suppress competition by enacting that nobody should pay a seaman more than thirty-five shillings a month. This prohibition was not to apply to "voyages from any parts beyond the seas, to any other parts beyond the seas, or to Great Britain." Therefore, though it might have kept down wages on voyages which started in Great Britain, it did nothing to check the practice of demanding excessive lump sums for the run home from the West Indies. It must rather have stimulated desertion in the islands, from ships whose crews were engaged at a monthly wage for the whole navigation out and back, to others where the sailor could make a new contract to which the Act did not apply. This, at least, must have been its effect if it had any; but by most accounts it was a dead letter, and in 1745 a certain Mr. Chitty proposed to frame a new law for the same purpose.[1]

---

[1] Directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Guienne to Maurepas, 10 Oct., 1744, 9 and 30 March, 25 May, 1745, Archives de la Gironde, C., 4263 ff. 7, 13, 15, 19. It was in order to prevent these powers from being abused for private interests that an Ordinance of 1693 forbade the *Commissaires de la Marine* to own shares in privateers; they were still allowed, however, to take shares in the enterprise of fitting out for privateering frigates borrowed from the Crown (Lebeau, *Nouveau Code des Prises*, I, pp. 176, 196).

[2] There is a good essay on this subject by Professor Dora Mae Clark, in the *Essays in Colonial History presented to Charles McLean Andrews* (New Haven, 1931), pp. 198–224.

[3] 6 Anne, c. 37; 13 Geo. II, c. 3; 29 Geo. II, c. 11; *Gentleman's Magazine*, xxvii, p. 140. These foreign seamen were exempted from impressment by 13 Geo. II, c. 17.

This clause therefore failed to keep down wages in the merchant vessels and privateers, so that the Government had to take other measures for the purpose of attracting or compelling sailors to enrol themselves in the Royal Navy without raising their pay. It was the great argument for the press-gang, that it effected this economy. Indeed, if George Grenville was to be believed, the pressed men were detained for months, or even years, without receiving any wages at all. This abuse was explained by the fact that no seaman was entitled to pay until he was entered on the books of a ship of war; so long as he was only a supernumerary, he was victualled but not paid. A ship's press-gang often brought in more men than she wanted. The captain kept the whole catch as supernumeraries until he had chosen out the best to be entered on his books; then instead of letting the remainder go, he turned them over to another who did the same thing. Thus the least promising sailors might be tossed about from ship to ship for a long time without acquiring a title to a day's wages.[2] Grenville's

---

[1] 14 Geo. II, c. 38; Admiralty Minutes, 20 Feb., 1744/5, Adm. 3/50. Tomlinson, in his otherwise enlightened *Essay upon the Manning of the Navy*, proposed to return to the practice of limiting wages in the merchant service (*Tomlinson Papers*, pp. 128, 182).

[2] *Parl. Hist.*, XV, 844. Speeches in Parliament are never very reliable authorities for this kind of fact, even when they are correctly reported. Grenville was at this period a member of that quasi-Opposition which aimed at out-ranting Pitt, so his statements on a popular grievance are to be accepted with caution. But he had been a Lord of the Admiralty, and an active one, for some time; nor can he be accused, in general, of distorting facts. See also *A Letter to the Mayor of* ——, . . . *by a Member of Parliament* (London, 1758), *passim*, especially pp. 11–12.

Navy Act of 1758 contained a clause to remedy this cruel custom.

Delay in the payment of their wages was perhaps the greatest hardship which the seamen suffered in the Royal Navy. There were two reasons for it. In the first place, Parliament did not always vote quite enough for the current service of the navy, which therefore fell into arrears. When the Government had to choose between leaving unpaid debts which would bear interest, and falling behind with seamen's wages which bore none, it naturally chose the second. Some Acts were passed at the beginning of George II's reign for the better payment of the seamen's wages, but according to Grenville they had no effect after 1733. In this respect the Crown was less tender to its employees and their dependants than the owners of privateers, who often advanced money to the families of their seamen during the cruises.

The fear of leaving his family in want for months or years might well deter a sailor from volunteering for the fleet.[1] This was obvious, but the official mind was less able to conceive how men who had several years' pay owing to them could be so silly as to forfeit it by deserting. The legislators indulged in some rather cruel cynicism on this subject. The adversaries of Grenville's Navy Bill argued that the less, and the more slowly, the seamen were paid, the better,—not only because they wasted their wages intemperately when they received them, but because they were less likely to desert when there was something owing to them. Keep it from them to the last, and they would stay to get it. "Their growing wages is a deposit which detains them, it is a bank which they do not forget, which keeps them cheerfully together." [1] The commanders in the West Indies were genuinely surprised when the seamen despaired of receiving their due, and deserted their "bank" for a merchant or privateer who would offer them something in hand. Sometimes the inducement justified the risk by almost any standard; in time of war, for example, the masters of merchant vessels offered forty or forty-five pounds for the run home, which was more than a year's pay in the Royal Navy; but Commodore St. Lo remarked in 1728 that men who had three years' wages owing would even desert for ten pounds and ten gallons of rum. [2]

---

[1] Lascelles and Maxwell engaged a man to go out to be coachman at Barbados, whose chief reason for leaving England was the hope of escaping the press-gang. He was afraid he would not get his wages paid in the navy for two or three years; and as he had been a sailor, he probably spoke from experience (to Jonathan Blenman, 8 April, 1755, Letter-Books of Messrs. Wilkinson and Gaviller, Vol. VII.)

Naturally the naval commanders deprecated any measure which made for the more regular payment of wages. Admiral Cotes reported in 1759 that the Act of Parliament, which directed pay tickets to be made out for seamen sent to the hospital, had made it very difficult to prevent them from running away to serve on the homeward-bound merchant fleets—"If the seamen think they will save their wages or part of them by a ticket so made out, they will certainly desert more frequently than they do at present." The only remedy was to remove from the hospital to the ships almost every man who could stand, until the convoy had sailed and it was once more safe to trust the sailors ashore. Vernon had already experienced the same difficulty at the hospital, "not less than five hundred having deserted from the hospital in Port Royal since my being in command, which I believe have all been seduced out, and gone home with the homeward bound trade through the temptation of the high wages and thirty gallons of rum; and being generally convey'd drunk on board their ships from the punch-houses where they are seduced." He thought this breach of duty should be discouraged by a rigid execution of the rule that deserters should forfeit their wages, as the hope of some indulgence in this respect was a great inducement to desertion. Commodore Knowles went further and suggested that " unless some method is found out to deprive the seamen of their prize-money as well as their wages, when they desert, there will be no keeping them, especially when it happens their prize-money amounts to more than their pay, . . . for it being adjudged matter of private property, their attorneys will receive it, whereas if it became forfeited, when they ran away from His Majesty's service, and was appropriated to some fund, and the captains of ships directed, never to pay the whole sum (if considerable) at one payment, it would be a strong tie on the men, and certainly keep them in the service." In fact this was provided for by an Act of 1744.[1]

---

[1] See the whole debate, *Parl. Hist.*, XV, 839 *et seqq*. For the effect of delay in the payment of wages on the manning of the French navy, see Berryer's letter to La Clue, 21 April, 1759, A.N. Marine, B^2 363.

[2] St. Lo to Burchett, 10 Nov., 1728, Adm. 1/230; Davers to Corbett, 22 June, 1746, Adm. 1/233.

The long wait for pay and prize-money brought into being a class of usurers and ticket-holders who traded on the seamen's need for ready money at a heavy price. The immense discount on seamen's pay-tickets was cited more than once as the chief reason for the fewness of volunteers. Grenville's Navy Act of 1758 was meant to do away with all these disgraceful evils; but if it was effective in some ways, it did not free the Royal Navy from its dependence on the press-gang for many years to come.[2]

In fact, all other ways of manning the squadrons failed, and there was no recourse but to pressing. It was an old custom, and so long as the navy could not or would not keep its men by offering them advantages, it was a necessary one. Even the Government would admit that it was objectionable where it interfered seriously with trade or privateering; but certain rules had been laid down which were thought to mitigate its inconveniences.

---

[1] Vernon to Corbett, 5 Sept., 1742, Adm. 1/232; Knowles to Corbett, 10 July, 1744, Adm. 1/2007; Cotes to Clevland, 20 April, 1759, Adm. 1/235; *A Letter to the Mayor of —— . . . By a Member of Parliament*, pp. 54–6. Since Knowles reappears in several different capacities in the essay, it is necessary to explain that he served in the Leeward Islands, 1743–5, acting as Commodore in the winter months; in 1746–7 he was in North America, partly as Governor of Louisbourg and partly as Commodore; and early in 1748 he arrived at Jamaica as Rear-Admiral in command of the station.

[2] Tomlinson wrote that in spite of the Act, " We found seamen *full as averse* to enter voluntarily in the Navy as if no such Act had passed." (*Tomlinson Papers*, p. 121, note).

Except in very special emergencies when every other consideration must give way to the national danger, the press-gangs were expected to spare the outward-bound shipping so far as possible. To disappoint a voyage already as good as begun, by depriving the vessel of hands, was a manifest blow to trade. To press men at the end of a voyage already as good as concluded, was thought somehow to be less harmful. Hence the rule imposed on the commanders in the West Indies, not to press hands at all from shipping ready to sail.[1] The colonial Governments sometimes strained this rule; that of Massachusetts seems to have regarded as outward bound a vessel which had any prospect of ever leaving the harbour again.[2] Though this New England logic was inconvenient to the naval commanders, it had some justification. Where there was no great reserve of sailors to be drawn upon, it made little difference whether a ship's hands were pressed just after she arrived, or just before she was ready to start, unless there was a question of catching a convoy. If the master had time to seduce some deserters from another merchant, he could pass on the inconvenience of short-handedness to somebody else, but the nuisance to the community remained exactly the same. Therefore although Trelawny made a mistake in ascribing desertion and inveigling solely to the press-gang, it must have caused particular instances of them and increased them in general, at whatever stage of the voyage the pressing took place. Moreover, it was very hard on the sailors to be hurried away on a new service before the old voyage was finished. Some writers, like Tomlinson and Hanway, thought the men's lives were shortened by this continuous employment without any rest or relief on shore.[1]

---

[1] This rule was sometimes broken, as by Kerusoret at Cap François, who pressed from some ships which were actually under sail with his own permission (Fleury to Massiac, 5 Feb., 1759, A.N. Colonies, C⁹A 103). The press-gangs sometimes took men from the outward-bound ships in the Thames, to the great loss of the ship-owners. Henry Lascelles had to explain to some correspondents in Barbados the delay of their ship; the Captain "had all his hands on board, and was ready to depart, but that very morning there were number of press boats appeared all at once in the Poole, and swept away every man they could meet with, not excepting Mates. Captain Williams had some little notice of it an hour or two before, altho' it was so unlooked for, an sent his people ashoar, but this will not avail him much, for they dare not appear on board and it has detained him as well as many others in the same readiness" (to Clarke and Whitaker, 12 June, 1741, Letter-Books of Messrs. Wilkinson and Gaviller, Vol. I.)

[2] This, at least, was Forrest's contention in 1745 (see his letter to Corbett, 26 Nov., 1745, S.P. 42/30 f. 117).

The Admiralty, however, made no objection to pressing from incoming vessels. The rule in the West Indies was to take one sailor in five, except from slave traders who were to contribute one in three, because a great part of their crews was superfluous after they had arrived in the islands. The merchants accepted this proportion as reasonable and customary; in fact it was part of the agreement made (and broken) by the Admiral and the merchants at Jamaica in 1745. In the Seven Years War, when the colonial Governments had some say in the matter, the proportion was altered at Jamaica to one in seven.[2]

The right of pressing men at the end of a voyage was not always exercised very wisely. On one occasion a slave ship was in serious danger of a revolt among the cargo, because the crew was reduced by the press-gang before the voyage was really finished. Though such a ship might be able to spare seamen after her arrival, she could obviously afford to do so less than any other kind of vessel while she was still on her voyage.[3] Other ships appear to have been stranded because their men were pressed before they quite reached port.[1] Yet if the men-of-war waited for the shipping to arrive, they were cheated of their men. Not only privateers, but trading vessels too, landed as many of their crews as they could spare in an out-bay just before they reached a place where they knew they would meet a press-gang. Vernon ordered Captain Mitchell to meet ships to windward of Port Royal and escort them into harbour in order that their whole crews might be taxed for the usual proportion of men.[2] The navy combined the press-gang with the protection of trade in other ways: when the commander of a homeward convoy neared England, he set to work to press as many men as he could from the ships under his care; no doubt this is the reason why the merchantmen always proved so elusive and refractory going up the Channel.[3]

---

[1] *Tomlinson Papers*, pp. 123, 124 note.

[2] Vernon to Burchett, 19 July, 1740, Adm. 1/232; Deposition of Manning, 10 Nov., 1745, Adm. 1/233; Jamaica Council Minutes, 11 Oct., 1759, C.O. 140/38; see also *C.S.P. Col., 1702–3*, no. 124, by which it appears that one in five was the rule at Jamaica in Benbow's time.

[3] Admiralty Minutes, 21 Jan., 1743/4, Adm. 3/47; Orders to Davers, 10 June, 1745, Adm. 2/64, p. 225.

These were only incidents of a system which was for some time tolerated as a necessity. At one point, however, the system itself was attacked. The colonists disliked measures which would endanger the plenty of their markets by discouraging the North American traders from frequenting them. The press-gang was commonly held to have this effect. As Brigadier Wentworth pointed out to Vernon, any trade between Jamaica and the Northern Colonies must be carried on in the shipping of the latter, since the West

---

[1] Lascelles and Maxwell to Samuel McCall, 13 May, 1755, Letter-Books of Messrs. Wilkinson and Gaviller, Vol. VII; *Tomlinson Papers*, p. 177.

[2] Vernon, orders to Mitchell, 26 June, 1742, S.P. 42/90, f. 209; Robinson to Newcastle, 25 June, 1743, C.O. 28/46; Orders to Ogle, 2 March, 1742/3, Adm. 2/59, p. 349; Davers to Corbett, 5 Aug., 1745, Adm. 1/233.

[3] Rodney, orders to O'Bryan, 13 July, 1762 (Public Record Office, Rodney Papers, Vol. 2, p. 294); Ourry to Clevland, 13 July, 1762, Adm. 1/2246; see also the very detailed description in the *Tomlinson Papers*, p. 185, and *C.S.P. Col. 1710–11*, no. 172 (i), in which the Lords of the Admiralty describe the way men were pressed at the return of their ships from the colonies. Yet the seamen sometimes refused to sail without convoy (Henry Lascelles to Ruth Miller and George Maxwell, 20 April, 1741, Letter-Books of Messrs. Wilkinson and Gaviller, Vol. I). Perhaps an outward convoy was not so dangerous to their liberty.

Indians had almost ceased to possess small vessels, and could neither man nor equip them to such advantage as the North Americans.[1] It was therefore most important not to frighten the North American traders away. The cry was raised several times in Jamaica, that the Admirals' insistence on their right to press out of North American vessels would produce, or was already producing a famine. Even before the Spanish war broke out, Trelawny wrote home in 1739 that pressing was sure to discourage the North Americans from bringing their provisions to Jamaica. A controversy on this subject produced a famous scuffle between Trelawny and the Admirals in 1742. Trelawny continued to complain of Admiral Sir Chaloner Ogle, after Vernon had gone home, and the pressing of North American seamen was one of the chief ingredients of the complicated dispute between Admiral Davers and the merchant Edward Manning.[2] This dispute was the more bitter, because it was not only the consumers who were afraid that the press-gang would cause a famine in this way. The re-exporters of North American produce to the French and Spanish colonies felt their interests to be threatened likewise.[3]

Why were the North Americans so easily discouraged and so peculiarly afraid of pressing? Davers might well ask this question; and no doubt there was some exaggeration in the descriptions of their unique sensibility. Yet there may have been reasons for it, as Trelawny dimly apprehended. The distinction between seamen and landmen was probably less marked in America than in Europe. The sailors of the mother-country were a professional class to whom it was no hardship to spend most of their lives at sea and to return home seldom. The more elastic and less specialised manner of living in North America brought forth jacks-of-all-trades who were ready to make occasional voyages at sea, but kept their connexions with the land and sometimes a share of the land itself. In England the seamen were a part of the wage-earning class, which could only leave behind dependants. North America had hardly yet developed such a class, and some of those who went to sea left behind them affairs which needed their own attention. This, I think, is what Trelawny meant by saying that "they have most of them small familys and propertys at home, and when they are press'd their desire is so strong to return to their families and the life they were us'd to, that they desert the first opportunity they have or for the most part die soon if they can find no such opportunity." [1]

---

[1] Wentworth to Vernon, 12 July, 1742, C.O. 5/42.

[2] Trelawny to Wager, 8 Aug. and 22 Sept., 1739, Library of Congress, Vernon-Wager MSS.; Wentworth to Vernon, 5 and 12 July, 1742, C.O. 5/42; Vernon to Wentworth, 6 and 14 July, 1742, *ibid.*; Trelawny to Newcastle, 29 July, 1742, and 10 Nov., 1744, C.O. 137/57; Trelawny to the Lords of the Admiralty, 21 Dec., 1743, Adm. 1/3817. See my book, *War and Trade in the West Indies*, pp. 119, 121–3, for further details of the Manning-Davers controversy.

[3] Jamaica Council Minutes, 2 Dec., 1745, C.O. 140/31; second address of merchants favourable to Davers, 6 Feb., 1745/6, Adm. 1/233.

Trelawny professed to see the result of Vernon's and Davers' press-gangs in the brisk trade which the North Americans carried on with the Dutch colonies of Curaçao and St. Eustatius. He said he could produce instances of masters who could not get seamen for voyages to the English colonies while others, bound to the foreign islands, had all the hands they wanted, so that those who meant to navigate to the English dominions had to pretend to put up for the foreign.[2] Vernon would have said this was putting the cart before the horse; the real reason for the scarcity of provisions in Jamaica was the additional demand of the several fleets and armies in the West Indies, which raised the price in the foreign islands as well as in Jamaica.[3] There was more truth in Trelawny's contention that pressing drove the men themselves to Curaçao, which had always been a resort for miscellaneous seamen because of the opportunities of advantage and employment in the hole-and-corner trade which the Dutch merchants carried on with the Spaniards. This was an old complaint; a witness said before the House of Lords in 1707 that there were 1,100 English seamen at Curaçao, of whom 600 belonged to Jamaica.[1] This cannot be ascribed entirely to the pressing, for the French islands suffered from it as well as the English, although the press-gang was not so much used there. But there is no doubt that the press-gangs diverted trade from the ports chiefly frequented by men-of-war to others where they seldom came. Vernon attributed the dispersion of trade among the outports of Jamaica to this cause. The Boston merchants complained of the advantage which Newport derived from its freedom from the press-gang.[2] A doggerel ballad-advertisement for a Bristol privateer tells the same story—

---

[1] Trelawny to Newcastle, 29 July, 1742, C.O. 137/57.

[2] Trelawny to Newcastle, 10 Nov., 1744, C.O. 137/57; second petition of Manning party against Davers, 28 Nov., 1745, and annexed affidavit of Henry Ram, C.O. 137/57; Petition of Drake and Long to the King, 1746, S.P. 42/89.

[3] Vernon to Wentworth, 14 July, 1742, C.O. 5/42.

" Here is our chief encouragement, our ship belongs to Bristol,
Poor Londoners when coming home they surely will be press'd all;
We've no such fear when home we steer, with prizes under convoy,
We'll frolick round all Bristol town, sweet liberty we enjoy." [3]

Trelawny suggested that the infrequency of the men-of-war's visitations accounted partly for the popularity of

---

[1] *Historical Manuscripts Commission, House of Lords MSS., New Series*, VII, p. 227; *C.S.P. Col. 1704–5*, no. 437. The Jamaica privateers said in a later controversy that the Act of 1708, which remedied the situation, resulted in the return of hundreds of seamen to Jamaica. (*C.S.P. Col. 1710–11*, no. 170 (iii).)

[2] Trelawny to Lords of the Admiralty, 21 Dec., 1743, Adm. 1/3817; Shirley to Newcastle, 31 Dec., 1747, C.O. 5/901. Dudley reported the same thing in Queen Anne's reign, but he attributed the popularity of Rhode Island to other causes besides immunity from the press-gang (*C.S.P. Col. 1702–3*, no. 1094; *1704–5*, no. 410).

[3] J. W. Damer Powell, *Bristol Privateers and Ships of War* (Bristol, 1930), p. 140. Laporte-Lalanne complained that the " Frères de la Coste," who did all the coasting trade of St. Domingue, were beginning to disappear in order to escape Périer's press-gangs (to Machault, 5 June, 1756, A.N. Colonies, C^{9}A 99).

New Providence in the Bahamas as a resort for privateers.[1] Perhaps he was right; but the other advantages of the situation would have been enough by themselves to make it a good place to dispose of prizes.

The competition of privateers for sailors was probably much severer than that of the merchant ships, and they were much better able to elude the press-gangs. Certainly the naval commanders in the West Indies were bitterer against them, and regarded them as a greater nuisance. In fact they seem almost to have thought that the merchant ship-owners were potential allies, or at least as great sufferers as themselves by the unscrupulous practices of the privateers.[2] This animosity against the privateers probably had some other causes, which this is not the place to discuss.

For various reasons privateering was much more attractive than service in the Royal Navy. Many stories are told of the way the privateers stole each other's sailors and seduced men out of the King's ships.[3] They regarded the King's men-of-war as fair game, and stuck at nothing to get their men out of them. Details of this would be tedious; it was always happening, and in every possible way. The naval commanders could sometimes, but not always, come to some agreement with the privateers. Commodore Warren claims to have succeeded in doing so at New York, but Knowles failed in the West Indies. They promised Warren not to sail from any port where his ships lay without letting him know, in order that he might have their vessels searched for deserters. In return, Warren presumably undertook not to press their men—and indeed, if they loyally observed their covenant he would have little need to do so, for his sailors would be deterred from deserting him by the knowledge that no resistance would be made to a search and that he would therefore be able to fetch them back. Some other commanders exercised the same right without exciting any outcry ; but when Knowles proposed a similar arrangement to the privateers of Barbados they rejected it.[1]

---

[1] Trelawny to Newcastle, 4 Nov., 1745, C.O. 137/57. An instance of this at Bermuda is given in Popple's letter to Newcastle, 26 May, 1741, C.O. 37/29.

[2] Knowles to Corbett, 15 Oct., 1744, Adm. 1/2007.

[3] *The Voyages and Cruises of Commodore Walker* (ed. H. S. Vaughan, 1928), pp. 41 *et seqq.*; J. F. Jameson, *Privateering and Piracy in the Colonial Period* (N.Y., 1923), pp. 382–91.

The privateering interest was popular at home, and in the sugar islands it was probably more influential than the merchant service, because many owners of privateers were resident there, whereas most of the trading ships were owned in England. The Admirals often complained of the protection afforded by the public authorities to privateers.[2] Sometimes the authorities were themselves interested in the privateers, especially in the French islands. La Touche-Tréville, captain of the *Zephire*, applied in vain for men to Givry, the Intendant of Martinique, who was concerned in five privateers, and protected all sailors who engaged in that service.[3] The French officials who invested in privateers represented this as a patriotic demonstration intended to stimulate the public spirit of the inhabitants ; but it is hard to believe they meant to lose by it. The English Governors seem to have been more cautious. Some of them were suspected of an interest in privateering, but the imperfect lists transmitted to the Admiralty do not bear the suspicion out.

The privateers did not rely entirely on their popularity and influence with the Governments and magistrates. At the last resort they took up arms or raised mobs. Knowles encountered a storm in Antigua when he tried, largely out of ignoble revenge, to press privateers' crews. They overpowered his press-gang and ran away with its boat ; when he retaliated the next day by confining one of their lieutenants, they spirited up such a crowd that the Governor had to ask him to release the man. Soon afterwards they got

---

[1] Warren to Corbett, 8 Sept., 1744, Adm. 1/2654 ; Knowles to Corbett, 15 Oct., 1744, Adm. 1/2007 ; Jameson, *Privateering and Piracy*, p. 415.

[2] Davers to Corbett, 22 June, 1746, Adm. 1/233 ; Knowles to Corbett, 15 Oct., 1744, Adm. 1/2007.

[3] La Touche-Tréville to Machault, 16 Jan., 1757, A.N. Marine, B^4 77.

Knowles himself arrested and imprisoned for some days, and followed this up with a writ of *habeas corpus* in order to get another pressed man released. Having frightened off the Governor from interfering, on the pretext that this was a common-law matter with which he had no concern, they pursued Knowles' prosecution to the conclusion—a foregone one with a colonial jury—of a heavy fine. The tactful Warren arrived on the scene and patched up the affair by buying the privateers' vessel at an exaggerated price for the Government service. Unfortunately the Admiralty rejected this rather shabby accommodation, and either Warren or Knowles must have been left a loser. A similar combination of violence, prejudice and chicanery prevailed elsewhere. There were riots and prosecutions at St. Kitts. The Governor of Barbados only prevented a pitched battle between the sailors and the mob by calling out the militia, in whose ranks the hot-headed could be brought under some discipline.[1] This was nothing to the more celebrated tumults at Boston in 1745 and 1747. In the first of these, two townsmen were eventually killed in a scuffle, and in the second, the Governor had to retire to the castle, the militia hung back from doing its duty, and the furious Admiral was only just restrained from bringing his guns to bear on the town.[2]

There were no such disorders in Jamaica, but the controversy was the same. Admiral Ogle promised Trelawny to take no men from privateers; but he broke his word, exasperated no doubt by the ingenuity with which they seduced his sailors. According to Trelawny, this discouraged the privateers so much that the number of privateering

---

[1] Knowles' memorial to the Admiralty, 1743, Adm. 1/2006; Knowles to Corbett, 17 March, 1743/4, 15 Oct., 1744, Adm. 1/2007; Warren to Corbett, 24 May, 1744, Adm. 1/2654; Robinson to Newcastle, 10 May, 1744, C.O. 28/46.

[2] Shirley to Newcastle, 1 and 31 Dec., 1747, C.O. 5/901. For an account of armed disturbances between sailors and press-gangs at Cork, see Adm. 2/371 (Lords of the Admiralty to Bedford, 8 Dec., 1758). See also Damer Powell, *op. cit.*, p. 206, and Gomer Williams, *The Liverpool Privateers* (London, 1897), pp. 157–9.

BIBL. [illegible] UNIV.

vessels fell from thirty to three. Davers was charged with pressing privateers' crews; but it is plain from the documents which his enemies quoted that he must have had particular reason to suspect certain privateers of seducing or concealing his men.[1]

The naval commanders were so much irritated by all these embroilments, that the more hot-headed openly wished the number of privateers could be reduced, or at least that no new commissions should be granted. Knowles and Lisle at the Leeward Islands tried to convert Governors Robinson and Mathew to this view. Robinson actually ceased for a time to grant commissions at Barbados, but Mathew tried to avoid a definite attitude; however, his caution did not save him from unpopularity in Antigua, where he was suspected of taking Knowles' part.[2]

In so far as the privateers helped to destroy the enemy's trade and enriched the nation by their prizes, they seemed to deserve encouragement; besides this, they sometimes afforded some protection to our own trade. The Admiralty did its best to have them exempted from the press, but does not seem to have meant that exemption to be universal. On the one hand, it instructed Captain Thompson, at New England, not to press from letter-of-marque ships actually employed in service against the enemy. A captain in the Downs, however, was ordered to press one man in six from homeward-bound privateers but not from the outward-bound.[3] Although the commanders in the West Indies were told to use their power of pressing circumspectly, they were not forbidden to take any men at all from privateers, but only commanded to respect the protections granted by the Admiralty. Such protections were often issued for the crews of particular ships, but conditions were generally attached to them; a certain proportion of the men must be landmen, and the owners had sometimes to give up some of their sailors to the Government in order to buy a protection for the rest.[1] Sometimes the Admiralty had to break through its own protections, but a commander on a colonial station would hardly dare to disregard them.[2]

---

[1] Trelawny to Newcastle, 12 June, 1744, and 4 Nov., 1745, C.O. 137/57.

[2] Lisle to Mathew, 24 Oct., 1743, Adm. 1/2041; Mathew to Lisle, 25 Oct., *ibid.*; Lisle to Corbett, 25 Oct., *ibid.*; Antigua Assembly Minutes, 21 June, 1743, C.O. 9/15; Knowles to Corbett, 15 Oct., 1744, Adm. 1/2007; Robinson to Newcastle, 24 March, 1744/5, C.O. 28/46.

[3] Corbett to Thompson, 27 Oct., 1741, Adm. 2/474; Orders to Windham, 12 Aug., 1745, Add. MSS. 19031, f. 192.

The navy was not always left to its own discretion in this matter. The abuses of the press-gang united two of the most popular influences in England against it—the privateering interest and the American trade. The privateers had been fighting hard for favourable legislation throughout the reigns of William III and Anne. They gained their point in 1708, and one result of their triumph was an Act of Parliament which appeared to abolish the press-gang in America.[3] It made one important exception:—it was not to prevent the forcible recovery of those who should thereafter desert from the men-of-war. The commanders of privateers and merchant vessels were expected to satisfy themselves that the seamen whom they hired were not deserters. They had to carry attested lists of their crews, and produce them on demand to any captain of a man-of-war, in order to show whether they had any deserters on board. The squadrons in America were thus to be protected as before against the loss of their crews by desertion, but could not draw on the merchant ships to replace the ordinary mortality. For this purpose the navy had to send over reinforcements.

---

[1] James Wymble received one for 150 men in 1740, on condition that half of them should be landmen (Minute of Lords Justices, 25 Sept., 1740, S.P. 43/99). When the French navy was hard pressed for sailors, it too obliged privateers to take a proportion of landmen (Chamber of Commerce of Guienne, minutes, 29 Nov., 1758, Archives de la Gironde, C. 4256, f. 75). Henry Lascelles and son complained of "the great expence in procuring protections which oblige us to find the Government with one man in four" (to Thomas Applewhaite, 17 March, 1739–40, Letter-Books of Messrs. Wilkinson and Gaviller, Vol. I).

[2] St. Lo, however, did so in 1728 (St. Lo to Burchett, 24 June, 1728, Adm. 1/230). The French Government, like the English, was sometimes reduced to pressing from privateers, limiting their numbers or even suppressing them altogether (Chamber of Commerce of Guienne, minutes of 29 Nov., 1758 and 22 April, 1762, Archives de la Gironde, C 4256, ff. 75, 166; memorial of the Nantes Chamber to Massiac, 28 Oct., 1758, C 4321, no. 52).

[3] 6 Anne, c. 37. For the discussion of pressing which preceded this Act, see the *House of Lords Journals*, XVIII, pp. 373 and 406; also *Historical Manuscripts Commission, House of Lords MSS., New Series*, VII, pp. 226–7, 231, 309–10.

This popular law was in some respects vague and impracticable. For example, who could tell whether a merchant captain had taken enough care to be sure that he was not hiring a deserter from the King's service? The penalty for secreting deserters could only be exacted from masters of ships, for which reason the Attorney-General of Barbados refused to prosecute an innkeeper; but it was the innkeepers who most and oftenest deserved punishment.[1] There was a further doubt whether the Act only prohibited the naval commanders from pressing on their own account, or restrained the civil authorities as well from empowering them to press. This question arose in New York; the English Law Officers advised that the Act did not tie up the hands of the colonial Governments from assisting the navy in this way. This was a strange opinion, and contrary to the apparent sense of the Act, which it deprived of almost all force and meaning. Before ever the Act was passed, the officers of the navy had been instructed to procure the Governors' consent for sending out their press-gangs. What difference then did the Act make in practice, if the same thing was lawful after it was passed?—except, of course, to provide a statutory penalty where there had been none before. The Law Officers' opinion does not seem to have had any practical consequence; the Admiralty and the Board of Trade continued to assume that pressing was entirely out of the question during the rest of the War of the Spanish Succession.[2]

---

[1] The Case of Jonathan Blenman, Add. MSS. 32921, f. 29.

[2] *C.S.P. Col. 1702–3*, nos. 124, 888, 1179; *1704–5*, no. 910; *1708–9*, nos. 747 (iv and v), 753; *1710–11*, no. 112; see also Dora Mae Clark, *op. cit.*, pp. 208–9.

Even more disastrous was the uncertainty about the duration of the Act's validity. The Admiralty asked the Law Officers several times, in later years, whether it had expired with the war during which it was passed, or subsisted without limitation of time. The Law Officers always reported that it had expired, and that pressing was once more legal without any restriction. This opinion was received in the West Indies, but the people of North America did not choose to attend to it. As they truly said, an opinion of the Law Officers was not a legal determination, and they preferred to maintain that the Act was still in force.[1] It is not easy to see why the Courts never pronounced decisively on this question, for the captains of the navy were often prosecuted in the colonies, and one would have expected them to appeal. Perhaps they were prevented from doing so by a circumstance first heard of in the War of the American Revolution. Admiral Sir Peter Parker was then frequently condemned in Jamaica to pay fines for transgressions of this Act, but never succeeded in appealing because the Governor was instructed to allow no writ of error for under £300, and the maximum penalty provided by the Act was £50.[2] However this might be, the state of the law remained uncertain. The validity of the Act was generally affirmed in North America but denied in the West Indies.

When the quarrel between Edward Manning and Admiral Davers reached its height at Jamaica, the West India interest in London could contain itself no longer. The colonists had borne with the press-gang in Vernon's time because their enthusiasm for the war was not spent, and useless as his expeditions proved to be, he could at least claim that he wanted the men for a definite public purpose. Even Vernon wore out the patience of Jamaica in the last months of his stay, and Trelawny, who was on the worst possible terms with him, taxed him with exercising his right to press for the sole end of displaying his authority.[1] This accusation could even more plausibly be made against Ogle, who never did anything at all, and Davers, who never did anything in particular. At the same time Knowles had aroused resentment in the Leeward Islands which Warren could not quite assuage, and the uselessness of the Royal Navy for any important purpose had never been more conspicuous than under Vice-Admiral Townsend and Commodore Lee.

---

[1] Antigua Assembly Minutes, 24 Nov., 1743, C.O. 9/15; Trelawny to the Lords of the Admiralty, 21 Dec., 1743, Adm. 1/3817; letter of Blenman in Barbados Council Minutes, 21 Sept., 1744, C.O. 31/23. Some people of Barbados asked the Governor for warrants of arrest against the officers of the navy under this Act, but he would not sign them (Robinson to Newcastle, 10 May, 1744, C.O. 28/46; Auchmuty to Corbett, 27 Nov., 1746, Adm. 1/3881; Lords of the Admiralty to Newcastle, 15 March, 1742/3, S.P. 42/26, p. 24).

[2] Parker to ? Sandwich, 23 Sept., 1780, Adm. 1/242.

The West India interest therefore resolved to make a protest. It sent a deputation to the Admiralty in the spring of 1746 to announce that it meant to ask Parliament to revive the Act of 1708. The Admiralty was not unsympathetic to the proposal, or perhaps knew it could not defeat it ; but it induced the merchants to accept two important modifications.[2] The first was, to confine the privileges of the Act to the West Indies alone. No reason appears why the Board should have ruled out North America so decisively, unless it was because the First Lord meant to send a great expedition there that year. The West Indians themselves were generally made to bear the blame of this restriction, which certainly looked as if it was due to favouritism or their sinister influence ; but the Admiralty Minutes prove beyond doubt that the proposal came from the Board. The Admiralty made a great mistake if it thought to facilitate in this way the raising of men in the Northern Colonies. Their inhabitants were very much annoyed, as well they might be, seeing that they had been protected, like the rest of the King's subjects, by the Act of 1708. Knowles attributed the violence of the Boston riots to this motive; but he was seldom at a loss for a wrong explanation of the disorders which were due to his own tactlessness.[1] Moreover, this injudicious partiality did not remove the doubt in North America whether the earlier law still subsisted; and above all, the framers of the Act of 1746 made one extraordinary omission:—they left the question of its permanence unsettled once again. Thus the same controversy raged over its survival as over that of the Act of 1708, and factious people in the colonies were able to assert or deny it as it suited their purposes. In general, however, the Act of 1746 was considered to be in force throughout the Seven Years War.[2]

---

[1] Trelawny tried to prove this by asserting that the press-gang produced very few sailors, and those of the most useless kind, since the crews of the little North American craft were quite unfit for men-of-war (Trelawny to Lords of the Admiralty, 21 Dec., 1743, Adm. 1/3817). This can hardly have been true, for no Admiral would have found it worth his while to press on such terms. But we do hear sometimes of press-gangs which lost more men than they took.

[2] Admiralty Minutes, 17 and 22 March, 1745/6, 10 April, 1746, Adm. 3/53 ; Petition of the West India Agents, 9 April, 1746, *House of Commons Journals*, Vol. XXV, p. 117.

Another important change was introduced into the Act in 1746. It permitted the naval commanders in the West Indies, with the consent of the Governors and Councils, to press men in case of the actual or threatened invasion of the colonies or any other great emergency. They were to take no more men than would make up their "usual or sufficient complement" and were to release them at the end of the special service for which they had been pressed.

The press-gang might therefore be legalised by the consent of the colonial authorities, and everything depended on the way in which they interpreted their powers. In the past, the Governors and Councils had usually distinguished between a press ashore and a press afloat. Even before the Act, a press ashore could only be made with the consent of the Governors and Councils, and they had generally given it. They had been quite ready to let the navy have the

---

[1] Knowles to Corbett, 18 Jan., 1747/8, Adm. 1/234. But it is fair to Knowles to add that Governor Shirley, a far more judicious man, bore him out (Shirley to Newcastle, 1 Dec., 1747, C.O. 5/901).

[2] Except by the incurably factious Attorney-General of Barbados (Barbados Council Minutes, 19 Jan., 1757, C.O. 31/28).

"straggling seamen" or the "idle and vagabond persons not indented, hired or contracted servants, nor sailors already engaged to serve on board any ship or vessel."[1] In fact, the civil power had actually co-operated in rounding up such people and sending them on board the King's ships. (The degree of co-operation might vary from colony to colony; for example, the Government of Jamaica often ordered the magistrates to take up stragglers by their own authority, but the Attorney-General of Barbados persuaded the Governor that the civil magistrates ought not to take an active part, but only at most to keep order while the press-gangs did their work.)[2] On the other hand, the colonial Governments would not sanction a press afloat among the crews of vessels in harbour.[3] After the Act of 1746 was in force, the colonial legislatures continued to go by the same rules as before. That of Antigua distinguished in 1757 between taking up stragglers and pressing men afloat. In the same year the Governor and Council of Barbados permitted Commodore Moore to press on terms which amounted to the same thing; he was obliged to relinquish at once any seaman whom a privateer or merchant captain claimed as part of his crew. According to Moore, this qualification made the permission quite useless.[4] In general, outside Jamaica the Acts of 1708 and 1746 seem to have had the effect of abolishing the press afloat.

A great deal turned on the definition of an emergency under this Act. The Council of Jamaica refused to let Commodore Mitchell press any men for an ordinary cruise in 1747, though it empowered the Governor to lend him some soldiers to man his ships (an expedient which was quite often used in the West Indies both before and after the Act).[1] Knowles, who was on much better terms with Trelawny than his predecessors, got a general permission to press for two months as many men as would make up his complement.[2] In the next war the Jamaica Government seems to have made a sort of standing order for pressing one man in seven out of all incoming merchant ships; thereby the intention of the Act was almost frustrated. The authorities of the other islands seem to have insisted somewhat more strictly, though by no means pedantically, on having an emergency proved, and attended particularly to the clause which provided that the men should be discharged at the end of the service for which they were pressed.[3] Sometimes they also took advantage of the men-of-war's necessities, or of the power which the Act had put in their hands, to dictate or suggest the service to be undertaken,—thus recovering indirectly the right of giving orders to the commanders, which they had lost in Queen Anne's reign.

---

[1] Jamaica Council Minutes, 7 Aug., 1739, 6 Feb., 1739/40, C.O. 140/30.

[2] Barbados Council Minutes, 21 Sept., 1744, C.O. 31/23.

[3] The Council of Jamaica had done so in 1726, but that was in a special emergency when the squadron had to be enabled to undertake a service of great strategic and political importance (*C.S.P. Col. 1726–7*, no. 374 i.)

[4] Antigua Council Minutes, 6 July, 1757, C.O. 9/23; Workman to Moore, 26 Oct., 1757, Adm. 1/307; Moore to Clevland, 29 Oct., *ibid.*

The officers of the navy disliked the Act and asked for its repeal. Yet in spite of their jeremiads they very seldom had to make one crew out of two, or keep an empty ship in harbour.[4] Some of the few occasions when this happened were before the Act of 1746 and cannot be attributed to it. The clauses empowering or obliging the Crown to send over reinforcements of seamen from England do not appear to have been very important.[1] In Queen Anne's reign the Admiralty, instead of complying with the law in this respect, had threatened to withdraw the ships stationed in the colonies when their crews became too small.[2] We hear nothing of such a childish revenge after the Act of 1746.

---

[1] Trelawny to Wager, 8 Aug. and 22 Sept., 1739, Vernon-Wager MSS. The heavy mortality and the Act of 1708 had forced the Jamaica squadron to rely very much on the soldiers in Queen Anne's war. The Governor reported again and again that the regiment suffered great fatigue in performing this service without which the ships could not leave harbour (*C.S.P. Col. 1702–3*, nos. 1055, 1119; *1704–5*, no. 164; *1706–8*, no. 1223; *1708–9*, nos. 68, 174, 339, 542).

[2] Jamaica Council Minutes, 29 April, 1747, 24 May, 1748, C.O. 140/32.

[3] Jamaica Council Minutes, 11 Oct., 1759, 13 Nov. and 16 Dec., 1761, C.O. 140/38 and 140/42. Earlier in the war the Council had insisted, like those of other colonies, on proof of an emergency and the limitation of the period for which the pressed men were to be kept on board (Council Minutes, 25 Oct., 1756, C.O. 140/38).

[4] Knowles to Corbett, 18 Jan., 1747/8, Adm. 1/234; Frankland to Clevland, 16 June, 1757, Adm. 1/306; Moore to Clevland, 29 Oct., 1757, and 13 Oct., 1758, Adm. 1/307.

The difficulty created by the limitation of the press-gangs was ordinarily overcome in two ways: by the routine replacement of ships in the colonial squadrons by fresh ships from England, and by the control of returned prisoners of war. The exchange of prisoners had many inconveniences: the "Flag of Truce" vessels which carried the prisoners to and from the enemy's colonies used the pretext for driving an illicit trade with the enemy, and the Frenchmen who were thus returned to Martinique and St. Domingue furnished the privateers of those islands with an unfailing supply of recruits, to the very great detriment of English trade in the West Indies. Nevertheless, the practice might also serve to replenish the crews of our own men-of-war. However, it did not always have this effect. The French Governors, especially those of St. Domingue, too often sent away their English prisoners to North America in the "Flag of Truce" vessels which came from those parts; they justified this on the principle of "humanity," for many of the Englishmen were natives of North America, and those who were not would be quite as glad to escape from the men-of-war who were waiting to press them at Jamaica and in the Leeward Islands.[3] Moreover, even if the French authorities consented to return the English prisoners to the nearest West India islands, the navy did not always profit by them. Most of the cartels for exchange of prisoners were negotiated by the Governors; their subordinates received the returned Englishmen, and allowed them to disperse themselves into taverns or other hiding-places where the press-gangs could not find them. Besides this, the prisoners of war sometimes took possession of the vessels which carried them, and put themselves on shore at outlying bays, beyond the reach of the press-gangs. Sometimes this was done with the connivance of the master of the vessel which carried them, but the prisoners often had to revolt in good earnest.[1]

---

[1] Only once, at Antigua in 1757, did a colonial legislature invoke this part of the Act by ordering its agent to petition the Admiralty for supernumeraries to reinforce the squadron (Antigua Council Minutes, 3 Feb., 1757, C.O. 9/21).

[2] *C.S.P. Col. 1708–9*, nos. 376, 649.

[3] See the correspondence of Admiral Knowles with Governor de Vaudreuil on this subject: Knowles to Vaudreuil, 23 Jan., 1748, A.N. Colonies, C^9A 73; Vaudreuil to Knowles, 6 Feb., *ibid.*; Vaudreuil to Maurepas, 22 Feb., 1748, Vol. 74; Knowles to Chastenoye, 29 Feb., 1748, Vol. 72.

To avoid these difficulties, the Admirals usually tried to make their own cartels with the French authorities, and to have the prisoners conveyed in ships of war or under a strong guard. By these methods the navy made sure of its men.[2] Finally, by the Order in Council of 25 March, 1761, the navy undertook the entire management and expense of the prisoners in the colonies, and thus at last exercised a control which it had possessed much earlier in the ports of Great Britain and Ireland.[3]

---

[1] Knowles to Corbett, 15 Oct., 1744, Adm. 1/2007; Warren to Corbett, 22 Dec., 1744, Adm. 1/2654; Holmes to Bart, 8 Aug., 1761, Adm. 1/236; *Valeur*, Derny, High Court of Admiralty Papers, 42/50; *Charming Elizabeth*, Fay, High Court of Admiralty Papers, 42/59. For similar complaints about French seamen, see Samson to Maurepas, 15 May, 1746, A.N. Colonies, C⁹A 67. The custom of pressing returned prisoners into the King's service was not unknown at home in England. On 6 July, 1757, the Admiralty decided not to use this method, but it changed its mind within a month and ordered all such prisoners to be secured (Minutes, 6 July and 4 Aug., 1757, Adm. 3/65).

[2] The Admiralty encouraged its commanders in the West Indies to get control of the returned prisoners if they could. (Orders to Lee, 15 March, 1744/5, Adm. 2/63, p. 340; to Legge, 12 Sept., 1747, Adm. 2/70, p. 275; Lee to Corbett, 9 July, 1745, Adm. 1/305; Douglas to Clevland, 29 Nov., 1760, Adm. 1/307.) In 1748 it asked Newcastle to make the colonial governors acquiesce (Lords of the Admiralty to Newcastle, 5 Feb., 1747/8, S.P. 42/33, f. 23). Putting a guard on Flags of Truce was not an infallible precaution against attempts to escape, for English privateers sometimes boarded the vessel, overpowered the guard, and removed the prisoners to enlist them in their own crews (L'Abarer to Pocock, Dec., 1747, Adm. 1/2289; Pocock to Corbett, 12 Jan., 1747/8, *ibid.*).

[3] See also Admiralty Minutes, 3 April, 1761, Adm. 3/68.

From that time until the end of the Seven Years War, the naval authorities seem to have possessed at least some of that command over the services of the sea-faring population, of which the limitations upon the use of the press-gang had deprived them. Moreover the press-gang itself, limited in the manner which I have described, continued to exist; and in spite of all the mitigations which the Acts of Parliament applied, it put the ship-owners to infinite inconvenience—more, perhaps, in England than in the colonies. It raised wages, delayed and frustrated voyages, and exposed the merchant vessels to danger by depriving them of their men.[1] The liberty of employing foreign seamen up to three-quarters of the crew appears to have been a very slight compensation for all these evils. Yet the navy had to rely upon the press-gang for many years to come, and the West India colonists were lucky to have procured for themselves mitigations of the system which were not enjoyed by the North Americans or by their countrymen at home.

---

[1] The correspondence of Messrs. Lascelles and Maxwell is full of complaints of the press-gang: see their letters to Benjamin Charnocke, 11 Feb., 1743/4; to Pantaliam Fernandez, 17 Feb., 1755; to Jonathan Blenman, 21 April, 1755; to Thomas Stevenson, 30 April, 1755, etc.—all in the Letter-Books of Messrs. Wilkinson and Gaviller.

THE DUKE OF MAR IN EXILE, 1716–32[1]

By Maurice Bruce, B.A.

Read 14 *January*, 1937

The reputation of John Erskine, 11th Earl—and in the Jacobite Peerage 1st Duke—of Mar, has never stood very high. The incompetence that he showed as leader of the rising of 1715 left him but a scanty title to fame, and his conduct during the sixteen years which he spent in exile was so bitterly criticised by his enemies within the Jacobite party that he is generally remembered only for the ineptitude he displayed as a military commander and political conspirator. Even when anything is known of his subsequent career, it is usually something to his discredit, and the old stories are still in circulation: indeed, the latest biographers of *The Old Chevalier* go so far as to describe Mar as a "rat," and call him the "evil genius" of his master.[2] A study of some of the sources for Jacobite History after the '15, and particularly of the Stuart MSS. at Windsor Castle, seems to suggest, however, that Mar has been somewhat maligned and misunderstood in the past. The Stuart Papers, now in part printed by the Historical Manuscripts Commission, certainly throw fresh light on many aspects of Jacobite politics, and in this age of "Historical Revisions" it is but just that Mar should receive his due measure of attention. It is true that Glover selected from the Stuart Papers and published in 1847 a number of documents relating to Bishop Atterbury, which treat in some detail the Bishop's quarrel with Mar ; [1] but, as Glover printed in full only the letters of Atterbury, his book gives a partial view of a controversial question. Nor did the more recent publication of Mar's *Legacies* by the Scottish History Society [2] throw much light on the subject, as they need to be considered in connection with the relevant parts of the Stuart MSS.

---

[1] Dates throughout are given in the New Style.

[2] *The Old Chevalier*, by A. and H. Tayler, p. 101.

It is the purpose of this essay to give what is believed to be a just account of Mar's life in exile. As space is limited, and most of the documentary evidence for the period up to 1719 is available in print, it is proposed merely to state briefly some conclusions as to Mar's activities in those earlier years, his career in the period after 1719 being reserved for more detailed consideration here.

From the moment of his flight to France in February, 1716, Mar enjoyed the unbounded confidence of James for nearly eight years, and, as the printed volumes of the Stuart Papers show, he played a very active part in Jacobite affairs, taking a leading share in the negotiations and intrigues which alone made exile endurable. He succeeded Bolingbroke as "Secretary of State" in April, 1716, and gained the confidence of the exiled King to such an extent that many raised the dread cry of "favourite," and seized eagerly at any opportunity that offered for pulling him down. Atterbury, who had applauded the dismissal of Bolingbroke, was actually among the first to oppose the new Secretary, accusing him of endeavouring to oust the Duke of Ormonde from James's favour.[3] But the Chevalier was devoted to Mar,[4] and until 1719 relied completely on his advice, though before that there had already occurred the first of those incidents of which the Duke's enemies later made so much. In 1717, when James was compelled to retire into Italy, Mar spent several months at Paris in order to see his wife, who came over from England to discuss their financial affairs, then in a poor condition. While there he called on Lord Stair, the British Ambassador, and is supposed to have made a request for a pardon. Stair's account of the interview, however, merely states that Mar "flung out several things as I thought with a design to try whether there was any hopes of treating."[1] The explanation of this incident may be found, perhaps, in the fact that at this time Parliament was considering an Act of Indemnity, which, it was hoped in Jacobite circles, would cover all who had been "out" in 1715. Mar took the view that the acceptance of an indemnity by a Jacobite could do no harm to the cause, and, as James knew of this opinion and of the interview with Stair, it is probable that the Duke had only been enquiring tentatively whether the Act was likely to cover him. As, at this same time, he was busily engaged in negotiations with Sweden and Russia, it does not seem that he was anxious to make his peace with King George. Financial security and the recovery of his estates were, in all probability, as much his aims now as they were later.

---

[1] *The Stuart Papers*, edited by J. H. Glover, 1847.

[2] *The Earl of Mar's Legacies to Scotland and to his son, Lord Erskine*, 1722–7, edited by the Hon. Stuart Erskine, and published by the Scottish History Society, Volume XXVI, 1896. Referred to throughout this Essay as *Legacies*.

[3] Stuart MSS. (H.M.C.), V, p. 555.

[4] Cf. the letters of James to Lady Mar, 9 Sept. and 5 Oct., 1719, printed in H.M.C., Mar and Kellie MSS., pp. 517–18.

In 1719 there were more serious dealings. In May of that year Mar was arrested by the Genevese authorities while on his way to Bourbon, where he had intended to take the waters in the hope of restoring his health, which the heat of Italy had seriously impaired. After the departure of James for Spain, earlier in the year, the jealous ambition of James Murray had converted the Stuart Court at Rome into a hotbed of intrigue,[2] and Mar was not sorry to leave Italy for a time. His detention at Geneva, however, lasted for thirteen months, and during that time he reopened the correspondence with Stair, hoping to induce

[1] *Miscellaneous State Papers* (edited by the Earl of Hardwicke), II, p. 561.

[2] Cf. Lord Pitsligo's account in Tayler, *The Old Chevalier*, p. 117.

the British Government, which had instigated his arrest, to permit him to be released. But the Government's conditions, which included the supply of information, were such as he could not accept, though his need of money was so great that he decided to negotiate for a pension, and refused James's request that he should return to Rome. An important factor in the making of this decision was, almost certainly, the failure of the recent attempt at a Restoration, while Mar was strengthened in his resolution by his fear of the Italian climate and by his detestation of Murray, who had been treating Lady Mar in a very cavalier fashion. His release came at last in June, 1720, and towards the end of that year he settled at Paris. There he received from the Government in December a definite offer which he immediately reported to James, adding that he had refused to consider it unless the Indemnity Act of 1717 were extended to cover all the exiles in general and not him in particular.[1]

A general indemnity, of course, even if the Ministry had been willing to make such a concession, would have given no opportunity for using Mar as a spy, and his conditions were refused. Nevertheless, in January, 1721, a new offer was made. Mar was to undertake to play no active part in Jacobite affairs, and was to receive in return an annuity of £2,000 from his estates, which were to be held in trust for Lord Erskine, the Duke's heir. To compel acceptance of this proposal the Government hinted that Lady Mar's jointure of £1,500, which had not been paid of late, might be stopped altogether, and General Dillon, one of the leading Jacobites in Paris, whom Mar consulted throughout these negotiations, agreed with him that these terms should be accepted. Accordingly Mar wrote to James on 3 February, 1721, to report this offer and to ask his leave for accepting it.[2] This was granted, albeit somewhat reluctantly,[1] and on 17 March Mar gratefully acknowledged James's kindness, which, he said, "he shall never have cause to repent of." [2]

---

[1] Mar to Hay, 23 Dec., 1720, and 20 Jan., 1721, and Mar to James, 3 Feb., 1721; from the Stuart MSS. at Windsor Castle, of which the writer was graciously permitted to make use.

[2] Stuart MSS., Windsor.

Yet repentance came later to all concerned. It is true that the Government allowed the Erskine estates to be bought back in June, 1725, and that the jointure was paid regularly, with arrears, after that date,[3] but of the pension Mar received not a penny beyond £1,000 advanced to him by Stair in 1719.[4] The Stuart Papers are full of complaints of his poverty, and his debts mounted so high that in 1730 a part of the estates had to be sold.[5] If the Government expected more of him than he told James, the suspension of both pension and jointure seems to be sufficient proof that he did not betray party secrets. But this is not all, for during the Plot Scare of 1722 the Ministry actually complained of the lack of information from him. On 20 July, while Mar was taking the waters at Forge, Lord Lansdowne, better known, perhaps, as "Granville the Polite," reported to James that Lady Mar's father, the Whig Duke of Kingston, had sent her "a severe letter," announcing that orders had been given for the suspension of payments of her jointure, as her husband was "believed to have prevaricated" when pressed to send information.[6] Lansdowne hoped that this letter would check the rumours of Mar's treachery that were already being spread as a result of the Duke's action in coming to terms with the Government, for, as Lansdowne himself said, "it is a very hard case that a man must be either starv'd or hang'd to be believed honest."

It may be argued, of course, that this step was a mere device to lull suspicion, and this was actually the view taken by Atterbury, who believed that Mar was receiving £3,000 a year in return for a regular supply of information,[1] but such an opinion is hardly compatible with the facts. There seems to be no doubt as to Mar's poverty, and the amount of information possessed by the Government concerning Jacobite activities was usually meagre. Hence the alarm when, in April, 1722, the French Government reported that another Jacobite invasion was being planned. In any case the Ministry's disappointment was not expressed by the Duke of Kingston alone. In May, 1722, Colonel Churchill, a nephew of the great Marlborough, had been sent to Paris to get more information about the Jacobite designs,[2] and had several times seen Mar, from whom, however, he seems to have learnt nothing. Cardinal Dubois, the French Minister, expressed surprise when he heard of these meetings, but Carteret explained through Sir Luke Schaub, the British representative in Paris, that Churchill had only been carrying out his instructions, " parcequ'il y a long tems que Mar a eû des obligations au Roy quoique je craigne à présent qu'il se soit rangé avec l'Ennemi." [3] This, in itself, is significant, but it is not all. On 15 May Carteret sent to Schaub copies of some intercepted letters together with " nos conjectures sur quelques-uns des noms empruntez " for which Schaub was to endeavour to obtain " des indices plus positifs." [4] In fulfilling this charge Schaub was permitted to ask the assistance of Churchill and of another British agent in Paris, Crawford, who for some time had been employing spies, to whom he paid one guinea a week for their services,[5] and who had recently been allowed £500 for secret-service work among the Jacobites.[6] With this £500 Crawford set his agents to work " tant pour déterrer

---

[1] James to Mar, 22 Feb., 1721; Windsor.

[2] Stuart MSS., Windsor.

[3] *Legacies*, p. 189.

[4] *Ibid.*, and Dillon to Carte, 1724, quoted by E. Handasyde, *Granville the Polite*, p. 262. Cf. A. Lang and A. Shield, *The King over the Water*, pp. 354 and 365.

[5] *Legacies*, p. 142 n. (Introduction).

[6] Lansdowne to James, 20 July, 1722; Windsor.

[1] Lord Faulkland to James, 29 Aug., 1722; Windsor.

[2] Carteret to Schaub, 6 May, 1722; B.M. Add. MSS. 22517, f. 48. Printed in *British Diplomatic Instructions* (ed. Wickham Legg), IV, p. 30.

[3] Carteret to Schaub, 18 June, 1722; B.M. Sloane MSS., 4204, f. 79.

[4] Carteret to Schaub, 15 May, 1722; B.M. Add. MSS. 22517, f. 62.

[5] Crawford to Carteret, 21 Jan., 1722; P.R.O., S.P., 78–177.

[6] Carteret to Crawford, 10 May, 1722; B.M. Add. MSS. 22517, f. 55.

une liste de ces nommes (i.e. the " conjectures " of Carteret), que pour découvrir à fond les desseins . . . des Jacobites."[1] How much he was able to discover it is difficult to say, though Churchill certainly carried some information to London on his return, but it seems not unreasonable to suggest that, if Mar had been playing the traitor, it would hardly have been necessary for the Government to spend even £500 on the verification of their " conjectures."

There is more evidence, for on 20 May, 1722, Schaub reported that the cipher " 918 " referred to Mar, " qui, je pense, cache ses Démarches de sa Femme."[2] This seems to suggest that the Ministry had been assuming that the Duke had kept his promise to take no part in Jacobite affairs, and that his wife, from design or ignorance, had encouraged this opinion. Whether or not that were the case, it does not seem likely that Mar would himself reveal the cipher under which he had been carrying on a secret correspondence, but many in the Jacobite party, finding the British Government too vigilant for them, now believed that Mar had shown his gratitude for a pension by deciphering intercepted letters.

The English Jacobites in particular, frustrated in their extravagant schemes for a rising by the Government's precautions and by their own folly, were not slow to find a scapegoat. By August, 1722, Atterbury, at least, was convinced of Mar's guilt. Actually the first information concerning the Jacobite hopes for a rising in the spring of 1722 had been given by the Regent of France,[3] to whom James had applied for assistance, and more was gathered from letters stopped in the post and from the indiscreet behaviour of the conspirators. But from Mar nothing appears to have been gleaned. Nevertheless he did send two letters, one of which seemed to Atterbury conclusive proof of his treachery. The first was written under pressure from Carteret and Churchill, who demanded that he should do something to justify the Government's generosity, but it was actually an attempt to persuade the Ministry that nothing was afoot and was drawn up with the assistance of Dillon and Lansdowne, while James gave his approval.[1]

---

[1] Schaub to Carteret, 20 May, 1722 ; B.M. Add. MSS. 22522, f. 229.

[2] Schaub to Carteret, 20 May, 1722 ; B.M. Add. MSS. 22522, f. 229.

[3] Schaub to Carteret, 25 April, 1722 ; B.M. Add. MSS. 22522, f. 185. Cf. Coxe, *Memoirs of . . . Sir Robert Walpole*, II, pp. 220 and 554.

The second was a more serious matter. On 25 April Mar had sent a dog, " Harlequin," as a present for Atterbury to the Bishop's chaplain, George Kelly, a non-juror and an active Jacobite agent.[2] Unfortunately the animal had broken a leg during its journey across the Channel, and Kelly had left it with a lodging-house keeper, Mrs. Barnes, telling her for whom it was intended. He had then seen the Bishop, and on 18 May wrote to Mar to tell him that " Illington "—one of the cipher names for Atterbury—was " in great tribulation for poor Harlequin," though very grateful for the gift.[3] This letter was copied in the Post Office, where the officials had been opening the French Mails since 4 May, and gave the Government a valuable clue to the identity of " Illington," one of the names to which they had not yet a key. Another clue was received shortly afterwards, for on 22 May Mar wrote to the Bishop to offer condolences on the death of his wife, who had recently died.[4] He addressed the letter to " Illington," of course, and it was duly opened at the Post Office. The Government now found that this correspondence was passing through Kelly's hands, and on 1 June he was arrested. Two days later Mrs. Barnes, under examination by " the Cabinet Council," innocently acknowledged that " Harlequin " belonged to Atterbury.[5] " Illington " was now definitely identified, and the Government's case against Atterbury was complete, although it was not until 24 August that his

[1] James to Lansdowne, 21 June, 1722; Windsor.

[2] Mar to Kelly, 5 May, 1722; from the copy in B.M. Stowe MSS. 250, f. 9.

[3] B.M. Stowe MSS. 250, f. 19.

[4] B.M. Stowe MSS. 250, f. 21*a*.

[5] B.M. Stowe MSS. 250, f. 2.

arrest took place. At his trial Walpole made great play with the rather slender evidence of " Harlequin " and Mar's letter of sympathy, and the Bishop was not alone in thinking that the letter had been sent in order to ruin him. But Kelly had actually been the first to establish a connection between " Illington " and " Harlequin " : the fateful letter of 22 May served but to strengthen the evidence. Mar must share the blame, for at the moment when he wrote Churchill was still in Paris and he must have realised that the post was no longer safe, though that does not definitely convict him of anything worse than folly.[1] As it happened, Atterbury had warned Dillon to send no letters through the post,[2] but it is by no means certain that Mar knew of this.[3] It may be argued, of course, that Churchill had persuaded him to write to " Illington " before it was known that Kelly had unwittingly supplied a clue to the identity of that person, and a comparison of dates does not make such a view untenable. The objection to this, however, lies in the Government's obvious dissatisfaction with Mar, while it does not seem probable that the Duke would have employed so clumsy and obvious a device to betray the very man who had long regarded him with suspicion.

Yet Atterbury, not unnaturally, was convinced that Mar had betrayed not him alone, but the whole of the body of Jacobites in England who had been planning a rising, and he went into exile in June 1723, determined to expose the traitor. His opinion of the reasons for the failure of 1722 was not shared by all in England. Lord Strafford, himself no paragon of modesty, laid the blame on the Bishop's autocratic temper. " Atterbury," he wrote to James on 29 May, " is so full of his own abilitys that if he can't have things go his own way, he would rather they did not go on at all." [4] This was almost a prophecy in view of the part that Atterbury was to play in Jacobite affairs until his disgruntled retirement in 1728. Many others had had good reason in the past to complain of his fiery nature, which the trials of exile and poor health now did nothing to improve, while his treatment of Mar, and of other Jacobite exiles, was unworthy of his rank and abilities. Coxe was more nearly correct than usual in his opinion of a Jacobite when he wrote, in his *Memoirs of Sir Robert Walpole* [1]:

---

[1] A. Lang, *History of Scotland,* IV, pp. 341–2.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 339.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 342 n.

[4] Strafford to James, 29 May, 1722 ; Windsor.

> Atterbury passed his time in exile in a manner which reflects no credit on the firmness of his mind, or the purity of his principles.

Unhappily for himself, Mar played into his enemy's hands. How he did this must now briefly be considered; it entails looking back to the winter of 1720, when he settled in Paris.

There he lived happily with his wife and daughter, for, as his *Legacies* show, he was devoted to his family, and busied himself with his musical and architectural interests. Many delightful touches in the Stuart Papers and in other collections show how much better he was suited to the pleasures of private life than to the trials of political activity. In spite of the promise made to the Government early in the following year, he had no intention of withdrawing from Jacobite affairs, and he continued to send to Rome long rambling letters, full of information and advice. With Dillon and Lansdowne he formed the triumvirate which controlled James's affairs in Paris, the most important centre of Jacobite activity abroad.

Of the various political projects, in which he interested himself in the years that followed, the scheme for the government of Scotland was the most spectacular and the most important, while it has never, perhaps, been rightly understood. In his own day it was regarded by his enemies as a further proof of his treachery, and in later times such authorities as Andrew Lang and Miss Shield have described it as "the coping-stone of Mar's follies." [2] It is certainly

[1] I, p. 173. [2] *The King over the Water*, p. 370.

an extraordinary piece of work, as a single extract is enough to show. In one part Mar proposes the revival of a national Episcopal Church in Scotland, for, he writes, "it is to be presumed that the nation is sufficiently weary of the sower [*sic*] Presbiterian Church goverment [*sic*] which enervates the minds of the people." [1] Yet at the same time the work is of interest as being one of the few constructive schemes produced in Jacobite circles. It is the only one at this period which faces harsh reality, though in doing so it reveals the political bankruptcy of Jacobitism by proposing the impossible as the only means of salvation.

Mar's purpose in drawing up this plan was twofold. In the first place he wished to repair the harm done to Scotland, in his opinion, since the Union of the Crowns in 1603, and the Union of the Kingdoms in 1707, and, further, to make English domination impossible for the future. The second objective was the recovery of the foreign support lost to the Jacobite cause since 1719. Both of these aims, Mar realised, needed the strongest measures for their accomplishment, and his suggestions, in consequence, were drastic, if nothing else. During 1721 he drafted the first part of the scheme, which consisted of thirty-nine clauses designed to free Scotland from the English yoke and to improve the internal administration of the country.[2] No details were overlooked, even an estimate of the annual cost of the "constant civil government," £27,100, being included.

On 17 November, 1721, the project was laid before James, with a long explanatory memorandum in which Mar excused the diminutions of the Royal Prerogative involved in the plan by arguing that they were necessary conditions of freedom from English domination.[3] That he himself had no doubts as to the wisdom of his ideas or as to the credit which would be his if they could be put into practice seems clear from the fact that, in the directions he left for the Monument to be erected to his memory in Alloa Church, he asked that the "Trofies of guilt [*sic*] brass" set on the sides of the obelisk should include "a representation of a bundle of papers teyd [*sic*] together, and Indorsed JEWELS FOR SCOTLAND."[1] A traitor would hardly have required his treason to be perpetuated on his tomb, even in "guilt" brass.

---

[1] *Legacies*, p. 197. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 194–205. [3] Stuart MSS., Windsor.

James received the scheme well, not because he understood its significance but because he still relied upon Mar's judgment and advice. Between January and March, 1722, he wrote a series of replies which were sent together on 10 March,[2] and these, as they expressed approval, drew from Mar an enthusiastic acknowledgment:[3]

> Never was a finer or more valuable New-years gift made by a Prince to His people . . . your letter must touch every Scotch heart [that] sees it and raise a new spirit in him for restoring his country to the happiness you propose for it.

Among the arguments he employed to induce James to accept the "Jewels" may be found the germ of a Memorial which Mar presented to the Regent of France in 1723 in the hope of achieving his second aim, the enlisting of foreign support. France and Spain, he assured James in the explanatory memorandum of November 1721, would welcome the separation of England and Scotland, since it would weaken the two countries, which together formed the most formidable obstacle to the achievement of Bourbon ambitions.

If, in consequence, France and Spain should help to restore the exiled King, the English ought not to criticise the dissolution of the Union, since they had shown themselves incapable of bringing about a restoration without assistance. This extraordinary argument is of a piece with the rest of Mar's opinions on matters relating to England. He had never understood English politics, and in exile his judgment was distorted by the conviction, to which the continued ineffectiveness of English Jacobitism lent colour, that the lack of support from England had been the sole reason for the failure of the 1715 rising. In this view he was strengthened by the collapse of the intrigues of 1722.

---

[1] *Legacies*, p. 192.

[2] James to Mar, 10 March, 1722; Windsor. Printed in *Legacies*, p. 206.

[3] Mar to James, 30 March, 1722; Windsor.

By the beginning of 1723 it had become clear that the chances of a Restoration depended entirely on some change in the foreign situation. The attempts made in the two previous years to bring about a rising in England had failed, as, indeed, Mar had expected they would fail, through mismanagement and lack of organisation, and in July Atterbury was carried into exile. The position of the Jacobites seemed to be desperate. In August, however, Cardinal Dubois died, and the French attitude became distinctly more friendly in the last months of the year. Dubois had been regarded as the only important enemy James possessed in France, and with his removal Mar saw an opportunity for regaining the friendship that the French Government had withheld since the death of Louis XIV.[1] Accordingly he drew up a Memorial, based on the arguments he had already advanced to James, setting out in it the advantages that would accrue to France from a separation of the English and Scottish Kingdoms, and proposing an alliance between Louis XV and the Stuart King for the achievement of that separation under the rule of a restored James "III and VIII." [2] This Memorial Dillon translated into French and presented to the Regent towards the end of September.[3] Orléans received it "very graciously," [4] hinting to the General at a levée shortly afterwards that he wished to discuss the matter in detail,[5] but on 2 December, before a meeting could be arranged, he died suddenly. After his death, Mar notes with pride in the *Legacies*, the papers were found in the Regent's desk, "Addrest with his own hand for M. le Duc [de Bourbon]," [1] but with the advent to power of Bourbon the situation changed yet again, and all hope of French support for the Stuart cause once more disappeared. Mar's scheme had failed, but not before it had achieved an unexpected result.

---

[1] Mar to James, 29 Sept., 1723; *Legacies*, p. 223.

[2] The Memorial is printed in full in *Legacies*, pp. 228–35.

[3] Mar to James, 29 Sept., 1723; *Legacies*, p. 223.

[4] *Legacies*, p. 167.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 168.

At first the scheme had been kept from James, as Mar realised that it would be unacceptable to English opinion and wished to sound the French Government before going too far. But on 29 September, when the Memorial had already been presented, he informed the King of the step that had been taken.[2] His letter was carried by Lord Southesk, who was about to visit Rome, but unfortunately Southesk lingered on the way, and did not arrive until November. Meanwhile Colonel Hay, afterwards Earl of Inverness, had been sent by James to see Atterbury, now in the Netherlands: on his way he stayed at Paris and visited Mar, who showed him a copy of the Memorial. Hay at once sent a report of this to Rome, describing it as "certainly good, but very ticklish." [3] He was not long to remain in this opinion, for in the middle of December he spent three days with Atterbury at Brussels, and heard for the first time the full weight of the charges against Mar. The storm had broken.

Hay himself was in the right frame of mind to receive Atterbury's diatribes. Earlier in the year he had quarrelled with James's wife, Clementina, and Mar had advised him to retire from Court in order to avoid further trouble.[4] Hay, in spite of the fact that he had asked Mar's opinion, resentfully regarded this as an attempt to oust him from the King's favour. From that moment he looked on the Duke with suspicion, and while he was in Paris sounded Dillon on the subject of the pension.[5] Nor did he omit to lay his suspicions before James, with the result that when the Memorial arrived in Rome it seemed to confirm the King's worst fears. He sent to Mar no acknowledgment of its receipt, and replied only in December, when he ordered the Triumvirate at Paris thenceforth to take no action in his name without his express permission.[1] This marks the turning-point in his attitude towards Mar: he was now in the mood for the accusations of Atterbury. Already Hay had assumed the chief place in his favour, and, as he had shown to Mar's critics in the past, the favourite of the moment could not err. It soon became obvious that a new star had risen at Court. In February, 1724, James wrote to Ormonde that Hay was now in all his secrets, since he was devoted to the Cause and completely free from "privat views and particalites [*sic*] . . . those that can serve me best being those he has most affection for." [2] His meaning is only too clear.

---

[1] *Legacies*, p. 168.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 223.

[3] Hay to James, 4 Oct., 1723; Windsor.

[4] Mar to Hay, 25 Jan., 1723; Windsor. Dillon and Lansdowne sent similar letters at the same time.

[5] Hay to James, 4 Oct., 1723; Windsor.

Mar did not fall without a struggle, but circumstances were too strong for him. As soon as Hay returned to Paris the coldness of his manner to the Duke was noticed by everyone, and in January Mar complained of it to the King.[3] By the end of that month Hay had returned to Rome, carrying with him Atterbury's opinion on "ye Light some how or other gained" from Paris "by those who use to pay well for their intelligence." [4] He had accepted the Bishop's suspicions in their entirety, and sought now to add proof to them by examining Mar's letters at Rome. The result was a disgraceful intrigue, to which James, weak and misguided as he was, lent the dignity of his name.

One point is sufficient to reveal Hay in his true colours. In his first letter to Atterbury from Rome he mentioned the "general reservedness" he had experienced at Paris, and ascribed it to "a jealousie that some had of my being charged with Commissions . . . unknown to them." [1] In view of his coldness to Mar, this throws a most interesting light on Hay's character. Lockhart was possibly not exaggerating overmuch when he described him in the *Lockhart Papers* as "a cunning, false, avaricious creature of very ordinary parts," [2] and saw "private malice," rather than zeal for the Stuart cause, as the reason for his joining in the attacks on Mar.[3] To Atterbury Hay now sent a copy of the Memorial to the Regent, thereby placing a potent weapon in his hands. At the same time he explained away the fact that James had given Mar permission to accept a pension from the Government by pointing out that the request for leave had been made in such a way that it had left the King no alternative but to agree.[4] There was, admittedly, some truth in this, though as Hay went on to maintain that James had erred, not in granting permission, but in continuing to trust Mar, it would seem that his aim was rather to add to the suspicions entertained of the Duke than to explain the action of the King. This information was intended also as a necessary precaution against the certainty that Mar would defend himself by producing James's letter of approval, which, as his enemies saw later, was generally regarded as an impressive point in his favour.[5]

---

[1] Stuart MSS., Windsor.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Mar to James, 10 Jan., 1724; Windsor.

[4] Atterbury to James, 23 Dec., 1723; Windsor.

With these additions to his armoury Atterbury moved to Paris in April, and although a weakness in his legs confined him to his lodgings for two months,[6] the last act of the tragedy soon opened. Another enemy of Mar now appeared on the scene. James Murray, later Earl of Dunbar and tutor to Prince Charles, a man of ability, but of an ambitious mind and a revengeful temper, had served James as Secretary during Mar's imprisonment at Geneva, but, owing to the hostility of other Jacobites, had been sent away from Rome in 1720, though he never lost the Royal favour. Mar had taken part in the attacks on him, on account of Murray's treatment of him and the Duchess, and the disappointed Secretary became convinced that the Duke had been jealous of his influence. On the arrival of Atterbury on the Continent he saw that an opportunity for revenge had come. He poured his own accusations into the Bishop's willing ears, and strengthened James's growing suspicion by assuring him that Mar had been trying to remove from Court all those "whom he thought capable to oppose or discover his intrigues." [1]

---

[1] Hay to Atterbury, 5 Feb., 1724; Windsor.

[2] *The Lockhart Papers*, II, p. 339.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 184.

[4] Hay to Atterbury, 1 April, 1724; Windsor.

[5] Murray to Hay, 9 April, 1724; Windsor.

[6] Atterbury to James, 19 June, 1724; Windsor.

The results of Atterbury's campaign soon appeared. On 25 February, 1724, James ordered Dillon to write on business to none but Ormonde and himself,[2] and although it was not until July that he confessed that he realised he had been "egregiously imposed upon" by the Duke,[3] he dated the loss of his confidence in him from the previous November.[4] The date is significant as being that of the arrival of the ill-omened Memorial.

Mar himself did nothing to improve matters. He wrote several angry letters, complaining of the "vile treatment" he had suffered at Hay's hands,[5] and talked loudly in Paris of the Despensers, and other "mischievous favourites" of past kings. This, of course, Murray gleefully hastened to report to Rome.[6]

Nor did Mar stop at that, for in April he took up the cause of the impoverished Scottish exiles in Paris, and committed the unpardonable folly of reproving James for not sending money to assist "your poor starving people, my countrymen here." [7] This was simply playing into the enemies' hands: the only dignified course would have been to give up all Jacobite business, as he had promised to do when he accepted the pension, and go into retirement. But this he would not yet do. Like many greater men, he loved power and intrigue, and he was not willing to recognise the unwelcome fact that the King who had so often defended him against calumny was now leaving him to his fate. In any case, though the intrigue against him was as obvious to him as it was to Lockhart, it was long before he realised the futility of resistance. Not until March, 1725, did he send his last letter to Rome. He probably felt, too, that a voluntary retirement would be regarded as a tacit confession of guilt, and this he was determined to avoid, though Atterbury hoped he could be persuaded to withdraw from the party "without an open Breach and without Noyse." [1] But a final breach was impending.

---

[1] Murray to James, 28 Jan., 1724; Windsor.

[2] Stuart MSS., Windsor.

[3] James to Atterbury, 4 July, 1724; Windsor.

[4] James to Dillon, 29 Aug., 1724; Windsor.

[5] Mar to James, 6 March, 1724; Windsor.

[6] Murray to Hay, 1 May, 1724; Windsor.

[7] Mar to James, 24 April, 1724; Windsor.

On 28 May Mar saw the Bishop, who asked to see his papers. Quite unsuspectingly Mar sent to him the following day twelve bundles of papers, which Atterbury carefully studied for several days. A week later they were returned with a note, in which Atterbury thanked him for his "frank and open manner" in entrusting them to him, and acknowledged that he had had "subsequent approbation" of his acceptance of a pension, which justified him "even in the Judgment of those who see that matter in another light." [2] This letter Mar, quite failing to see the sting in its tail, regarded as a recognition of his innocence, and on 12 June he reported to James the Bishop's change of mind on seeing his papers.[3] Probably he thought that the intrigue against him would now stop. Disillusionment was not long in coming.

An anonymous "Account of the Duke of Mar's Disgrace," preserved at Windsor Castle, gives the Bishop's real views, and they were laid before the King in a letter of

---

[1] Atterbury to James, 19 June, 1724; Windsor.

[2] Copies of this letter were sent to Rome by both Mar and Atterbury and are now at Windsor.

[3] Stuart MSS., Windsor.

19 June. The papers, says the "Account," did not include the Memorial, but even without it they proved Mar's "villanous practices and yet worse designs," and Atterbury told James that they had both confirmed and increased his belief in the Duke's treachery. Why a traitor should take the trouble to offer proof of his guilt it did not occur to him, apparently, to enquire. This letter from Atterbury removed James's last doubts. On 4 July he answered it, as has already been mentioned, by admitting that he had long been imposed upon by Mar. "I plainly see," added the deluded King, "that the Cause can never prosper, without I act in a firm and masterly way, and in being the sole and chief Director in my own business." [1] Unhappy man: he had but exchanged one master for another.

Mar soon knew his fate. At the end of June he saw Atterbury again, and heard with horror the charges that had been made against him; then, when the Bishop went on to suggest that he had been acting under the orders of the British Government, he rushed from him "in great anger and furie." [2]

After this Atterbury began to circulate copies of the Memorial among people in Paris, and Mar saw that the end had come. On 19 July, he wrote to James, more in sorrow than in anger, to complain of Atterbury's "treachery" towards him,[3] but without effect. Meanwhile a *coup de grâce* was being prepared. Hitherto James had been unwilling to bring about an open breach with the Duke, thinking that he would do less harm if he remained inside the party, though trusted by none.[4] But on 7 August Atterbury advised him to abandon this policy, as Mar was trying to win the favour of George I by alienating Jacobites in Paris from their rightful King.[5] Hay had already been suggesting that Mar took his orders from Horatio Walpole, now Ambassador in France,[1] and James responded as readily to the Bishop's advice as, in earlier days, he had accepted the guidance of Mar. At the end of August Dillon was ordered " to have no more communication with Mar upon my affairs," and to sever his connection with him if he wished to retain his Sovereign's favour, for " I am resolved to exclude not only Mar but all who shall have any dependance on him, or on whom he may have any influence, from my confidence." [2] There speaks a weak man, driven to desperate courses : yet again had James proved that those who had his ear monopolised his favour.

---

[1] Stuart MSS., Windsor.

[2] MS. "Account"; Windsor.

[3] Stuart MSS., Windsor.

[4] James to Atterbury, 4 July, 1724; Windsor.

[5] Stuart MSS., Windsor.

Thus ended Mar's connection with the Jacobite Party. He sent several more letters in an attempt to defend himself, but they remained unanswered. In the last, written on 18 March, 1725, he prayed that God might soon deliver the King out of " those perverce unchristian hands " into which he had fallen.[3] He soon saw part of his prayers fulfilled, for only a month later Atterbury quarrelled with Murray, and in 1728 the Bishop left the Party in disgust. The quarrel with Murray was patched-up before it had gone far, but is of interest as it shows how accurate had been Strafford's judgment of Atterbury's temper.[4] It also drew from the Bishop a most interesting letter, which effectively exposes his treatment of Mar and lends point to the charitable view that his conduct was influenced by ill-health.

> I meet with Difficultys enow from those who are layd aside [he wrote to James], and (at my Age, and in my ill state of Health, and circumstances) need no new one to exercise my Patience. And indeed, Sir, to speak my mind once for all, unless I can be perfectly secure of a strict Harmony and Openness between me, and those I am to act with, and can depend upon their good Offices, and Friendship, in every case (even where we may happen to differ a little in our judgments of men, or things) the State I shall be in, will be too uncomfortable for

---

[1] Hay to Atterbury, 25 July, 1724 ; Windsor.

[2] James to Dillon, 29 Aug., 1724 ; Windsor.

[3] Stuart MSS., Windsor.

[4] See page 69 above.

> me not to wish myself out of it as soon as is possible . . . if I err, yet my mistakes, I think, should not be exaggerated, or made matter of complaint, but either covered in Silence, or treated with Tenderness.[1]

This is, indeed, an interesting plea from one who, in spite of his office, had been so lacking in Christian charity when dealing with Mar. Atterbury would be more worthy of respect if he had made some attempt to cover Mar's mistakes "in Silence" or to treat them "with Tenderness."

Mar did not fall alone. Dillon and Lansdowne strove to defend him, and suffered for their pains. Dillon was dismissed in December, 1724, and Atterbury spread stories about Lansdowne that caused him to retire in despair four months later.[2] Yet the Triumvirate did not go unavenged. James's new advisers could not agree among themselves, and Lockhart recorded with regret that the old "dexterity" and "secrecie" had gone from Jacobite affairs.[3] That unhappy decline had set in which caused him to close his Memoirs in 1728 on a note of despair.

Of Mar there is little more to be said. He remained in and around Paris, amusing himself with his music and drawing, until 1729, when bad health compelled him to move to Aachen for the waters. There he died three years later at the age of 57.

* * * * *

The Duke of Mar was not a great man; he was not even a clever man, and that he filled the chief place in Jacobite counsels for some six years is proof only of the lack of real ability in the Party. But he was laborious and painstaking, and sufficiently devoted to the Jacobite cause to remain attached to it as long as he was treated with respect. His real interests were centred on his family and his estates, which he longed to pass on to his son,[4] for he valued the continuity of his line, and looked back with respect to his ancestor, " the good Regent." [1] Preferring not to starve for the Cause, he endeavoured to reconcile conscience with ease, and failed, as not a few have done. Loving his country, he tried to repair the defects he saw in her government, and thereby laid himself open to accusations that were probably unavoidable in a Party so largely out of touch with reality.

---

[1] Atterbury to James, 16 July, 1725; Windsor.

[2] Handasyde, *Granville the Polite*, p. 216.

[3] *The Lockhart Papers*, II, p. 404.

[4] Cf. Stair to Craggs, 12 Oct., 1719; Hardwicke, *State Papers*, II, p. 598.

In Scotland they called him " Bobbing John," and the name sums up his character, but to describe him as a traitor would seem to be unjust. Like his master, he was merely a man of no great ability, grappling with forces far beyond his comprehension and control, and the story of his career after the '15 is largely that of the Jacobite Party as a whole, a story of plots and intrigues, of hates and loves, of growing disillusionment and despair. He tried to save a cause that was already lost, though far from dead, but suspicion and misunderstanding brought him low, and he died in exile, reconciled to neither of the parties he had once supported. Exile is a stern test of character. Mar failed to pass that test, but the fault was not his alone.

---

[1] *Legacies*, p. 190.

THE EAST INDIA COMPANY "INTEREST" AND THE ENGLISH GOVERNMENT, 1783–4

(*The Alexander Prize Essay*)

BY C. H. PHILIPS, B.A.

Read 10 *June*, 1937

THE period 1772–84 was the formative period of British Indian history. During these years Indian affairs were constantly before Parliament; the questions of the relation of the East India Company to the State, and of the home to the Indian administration were dealt with, and the system of government instituted in 1784 was not fundamentally changed until 1858.

At no time was the question of British dominion in India so closely interwoven with political and party development at home. In 1783–4, for the first time in parliamentary history, an India question radically altered the course of politics in England. It caused the fall of the Fox-North coalition, gave George III the opportunity to make a daring use of his influence, doomed Fox to be "a voice crying in the wilderness" for almost the rest of his life, and put Pitt in office practically for his lifetime.

Between 1772 and 1784 the Company was subjected to minute and severe inspection at the hands of parliamentary commissions; firstly, the Select and Secret Committees of 1772, accompanied by the attack on Clive in parliament and the Regulating Act of 1773; secondly, the Select and Secret Committees of 1781, followed on the one hand by Pitt's India Act of 1784, and on the other hand by the impeachment of Warren Hastings.

The interference of Parliament in the Company's affairs was inevitable because, as some of the contemporary statesmen saw, there was a danger of a great empire being created and ruled by the British, independent of the authority of the British cabinet. By the Regulating Act of 1773 some attempt was made to control the Company. Down to 1773 the home government had consisted solely of the twenty-four directors and of the proprietors of the Company. The former had been annually elected by the latter, and the two had formed the only body authorised to issue orders to the governments in India ; prolonged conflict between these two authorities was obviously impossible. But the Regulating Act laid down that only six of the twenty-four directors should be elected each year ; now, with the proprietors continuing to enjoy their right to overrule the decisions of the directors, prolonged strife became possible and did actually ensue. Nor did the Act give to the Ministry the power of interfering in the Company's transactions, even though the arrival of every East Indiaman in the Thames was synonymous with the spreading of rumours of conflict in the Company's governments in India. In October, 1781, Philip Francis, whose hatred for Warren Hastings and consequently for the Company had become with him a mania, reached England and openly demonstrated that the Regulating Act had broken down. " It had neither given the state a definite control over the Company, nor the directors a definite control over their servants, nor the governor-general a definite control over his council, nor the Calcutta Presidency a definite control over Madras and Bombay." [1]

Although, from the time of the break-up of Lord North's Government in 1782, Ministry had followed Ministry in rapid succession, the changes had been, as far as the Company's affairs were concerned, more apparent than real : the Francis, Burke, Fox coalition had dominated them all. When North signified his adherence to the views of Burke by seconding the latter's proposal for laying the papers of Hastings's transactions at Oudh (1781) on the table, the friends of the Company saw that they could expect little mercy;[1] the hopes that had been raised when Dundas had shelved his India Bill in April, 1783, were lowered, and the inevitable only came more quickly when William Pitt in the same month challenged Fox to produce a plan, "not of temporary palliation or timorous expedients, but vigorous and effectual; suited to the magnitude, the importance, and the alarming exigency of the case."[2] Fox afforded his opponents little time in which to complain of his delay. Lord Mansfield and Lord Thurlow both warned Fox that he would imperil his own affairs by running to extremes on India, but Fox paid no heed and, when Parliament reassembled on 11 November, he gave notice that he would bring in his bill that day week.

---

[1] *Cambridge History of India*, vol. v, p. 194.

On 18 November accordingly, Fox presented his India Bills, prefaced with a detailed description of Indian "horrors" and entering fully into all the scandalous stories related in "those execrable libels," as Lord Temple called them, the Ninth and Eleventh Reports from the Select Committee. The main bill, known at the India House as "Burke's Bill," adopted the administrative system advocated by Francis.[3] This bill formally repudiated the policy attributed to Warren Hastings, but this caused no excitement in England, for attention was almost exclusively concentrated on the other, and, as it seemed to the Company, more revolutionary clauses. A body of seven commissioners appointed in the first instance by Parliament, and after seven years by the Crown, assisted in the management of commercial affairs by nine Assistant Directors, was to be created to take charge of the Company's political and commercial concerns. The Company was for the moment stunned, but by the 24th it had recovered its senses sufficiently to forward a petition urging that the Bill was an arbitrary defeasance of the Company's chartered rights and an unwarranted confiscation of private property. The Directors petitioned, the Company's counsel, Rous, Dallas, and Hardinge, spent many weary hours in proving that the Company was far from bankrupt, but Fox's steam-roller passed on its way.[1] On 1 December the motion for going into Committee on the Bill was debated. Burke rose to deal with the objections that had been raised against the measure. In a very long but very fine and eloquent speech, which included among other things a short geographical and historical account of India, he asserted that this Bill was to form " the Magna Charta of Hindostan." " Magna Charta is a charter to restrain power and to destroy monopoly. The present East India Charter is a charter to establish monopoly and to create power." [2] Fox developed the theme of the necessity for legislation on behalf of " the unfortunate millions of Hindostan," and there is no doubt that this aspect of the question operated most powerfully on the minds of both Burke and Fox. It may be doubted whether the Bills would have effectually checked the evils in the Company's service in India, but this question was scarcely touched by the Opposition.

---

[1] The Directors had snubbed North over the question of India appointments. *Home Misc.*, 173, p. 1, 27 May, 1783. North attempted without success to win over Sulivan, an important Director. Add. MSS. 29156. f. 450, 1 Sept., 1783. Sulivan to Hastings.

[2] *Parl. Hist.*, 23, col. 795, 25 April, 1783; J. Mill, *History of India*, vol. 4, p. 470.

[3] The other bill was a land bill, and it also aimed at the abolition of the custom of giving and receiving "presents." *Parl. Hist.*, 23, cols. 1187–1213, 18 Nov., 1783.

On 3 December Fox named the seven Commissioners: four of them, Lord Fitzwilliam, the Hon. Frederick Montagu, Sir Henry Fletcher, and Robert Gregory were friends of

---

[1] North played a small part: after approving of the Bills he stayed away from Parliament on the day they were introduced. Wraxall, *Memoirs*, vol. 3, pp. 146, 155.

[2] *Parl. Hist.*, 23, col. 1315. This speech, together with the 9th and 11th Reports of the Select Committee, forms a survey of the justice, administration, and internal trade of Bengal.

Fox ;[1] Lord North's interest was represented by Viscount Lewisham, Sir Gilbert Elliot, and Colonel North, whose proposal excited general laughter through the Opposition ranks.[2] It was certainly unfortunate that the Commissioners, all men of the highest character, were all at the same time avowed partisans of the Government. Even the nine Assistant Directors named were of the Ministerial party, and so great was the Company's outcry that two Director-Members of Parliament, Stephen Lushington and Jacob Wilkinson, preferred to refuse the position.[3] Fox was fully conscious of the dangers that he ran in introducing the Bills : "I am not at all ignorant of the political danger which I run by this bold measure but, whether I succeed or no, I shall always be glad I attempted because I have done no more than I was bound to do." [4] At the same time he felt confident of success, but he realised that every effort was necessary "because every vote will tell on account of the House of Lords afterwards." [5] On 8 December the Opposition made a last despairing effort ; William Scott appealed to Shakespeare, to Thucydides and even to the Bible in his efforts to prove Fox's motives wrong, but the third reading of the Bill was passed by a majority of 208 votes to 102.[6] On the next day the Bill went before the Lords.

Lord Thurlow and Lord Temple, who managed the Opposition, were as extravagant, if not as skilful in their arguments as Pitt had been. Whereas Pitt called the Bill "one of the boldest, most unprecedented, most desperate and alarming attempts at the exercise of tyranny that has ever disgraced the annals of this or any other country," [1] Thurlow was even more emphatic in telling the King that it was " a plan to take more than half the royal power," and the Lords, that " the King will in fact take the diadem from off his own head and place it on the head of Mr. Fox." [2] It is doubtful whether Pitt or Thurlow can for a moment have believed what they said. Loughborough, Townshend, and Carlisle, who answered for the Government, contented themselves with replying that it was impossible to regulate the Company's affairs without an infringement of its charter.[3]

---

[1] It is not right to say that these men were "better known at Brook's Club than at the India House." Holland Rose, *Wm. Pitt and National Revival*, p. 143.

[2] Wraxall, *Memoirs*, vol. 3, p. 159.

[3] *Parl. Hist.*, 24, cols. 1–10, 3 Dec., 1783. Second reading passed by 217 votes to 103.

[4] *Memorials of Fox*, vol. 2, p. 219.

[5] *Ibid.*, Fox to Lord Ossory, 21 Nov., 1783, p. 215.

[6] *Parl. Hist.*, 24, cols. 10–62. Sheridan appealed to the same sources to refute Scott. The *C.H. India*, vol. v, p. 199, wrongly quotes the opposition votes as 108.

In the meantime the Company's activities against the Bill included a strong appeal to popular sentiment, as the term was then understood. A special sub-committee of Proprietors was appointed to watch over the rights of the Company and it co-opted Laurence Sulivan, Edward Baber, and John Scott to collect material for the Company's defence.[4] This committee sponsored " an almost incredible circulation of pamphlets and political engravings " directed against the Fox-North coalition.[5] In circular letters which it addressed to almost every town or corporate body throughout Great Britain, it said with a conciseness that was admirable, " Our property and charter are forcibly invaded; look to your own ! " [6] Casual press notices mention no less than forty-four towns and five counties which deserved the formal thanks given by the Court of Proprietors for their support.[7]

---

[1] *Parl. Hist.*, 23, col. 1279, 27 Nov., 1783.

[2] Buckingham and Chandos, *Courts and Cabinets of George III*, vol. 1, p. 288.

[3] *Parl. Hist.*, 24, cols. 122–35, 9 Dec., 1783.

[4] *Public Advertiser*, 24 Dec., 1783. Sulivan, Baber and Scott were " Nabobs." Sulivan was first elected a Director in 1755, and he served repeatedly as a Director, often as Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Company, until his death in 1786. John Scott was Warren Hastings's agent in England.

[5] *Annual Register*, 1784, p. 69.

[6] Wraxall, *Memoirs*, vol. 3, p. 253.

[7] General Court Minutes, vol. 6, f. 323. " Thanks to such Corporations as by addresses to the Throne, or by instructing their members have shown themselves averse to the late violent proceedings in Parliament."

Opposition to the Bill, which was comparatively easy, was taken up by the caricaturists. On 25 November James Sayer published a caricature, "A transfer of East India Stock," in which Fox was represented as a giant carrying the India House on his shoulders to St. James's. Ten days later his most famous caricature appeared. Given the title of "Carlo Khan's Triumphal Entry into Leadenhall Street," it seized one aspect of the Bill with incomparable force, and the Company probably took steps to ensure a prodigious sale. Fox himself acknowledged that his Bill received its severest blow in public estimation from this.[1]

By 1783 the country's still fresh experience with the American Colonies seemed to give added force to the contention that it would be dangerous to place India under governmental patronage. The fact remained that "a handful of Proprietors and Directors and their servants" had been more successful than all the forces of the Crown, and the Company's pamphleteers were not slow to draw upon the comparison. "Some years since, the American Mania seized the Commons, now the Oriental Mania rages among the unprincipled. Each anticipates himself returning home laden with the plunder of the Ganges." [2] Scott thought this statement was not entirely at variance with the truth: "The patronage of Great Britain is so exceedingly lessened by the loss of America, that any Minister will try to get the East under the influence of the Crown." [3] Oddly enough, the desperate reputation of the Company and of its armies in India redounded to the benefit of the cause: "What has happened in America, may happen in India." [4] The Committee of Proprietors may not have achieved a victory for the Company, but it performed valiant work in spreading the opinion that Fox was unjust, and so strengthening the feeling that the Coalition was reprehensible.

---

[1] Sayer was rewarded by Pitt by being made Marshal of the Court of Exchequer, receiver of the 6*d*. duties, and a cursitorship. Wright, *House of Hanover*, p. 373. Another caricature that enjoyed wide circulation at the expense of the Company was one of Fox as Samson carrying off the ruins of the India House.

[2] *Public Advertiser*, 14 Jan., 1784. Cf. Pulteney's *Effects of Fox's E.I. Bill*, p. 23; *Examination of Fox's Bill*, pp. 12, 22, 59, *Proper Limits of Government's Interference*, pp. 10, 24: London, 1784.

[3] Add. MSS. 29160, f. 276. Scott to Hastings, 9 Sept., 1783.

[4] *Public Advertiser*, 2 Jan., 1784.

This Committee may also have been instrumental in bringing to the King's notice arguments against the Bill which he, in his dislike of the Coalition, was ready to accept.[1] "Had the opposition themselves framed a measure for the Minister, with the express purpose of widening the breach between the cabinet and the Sovereign, they could not have devised one better adapted to the purpose." [2] The King was already in touch with John Robinson, who was the essence of intrigue; George III apparently liked his fellow conspirator—"You do not change with the times, you are always steady" [3]—and a plan was evolved which they were both ready to carry through. Robinson's past experience of the India House was invaluable: already in 1780, in his dealings there, he had cemented an alliance with Richard Atkinson and Charles Jenkinson,[4] and he had again been in close touch with them from the beginning of February, 1783. On the 3rd of December, Atkinson wrote to Robinson, "Everything stands prepared for the blow if a certain person has courage to strike it." The three conspirators were working to bring together a body of Lords on the appointed day to defeat Fox's Bill. On the 5th, Jenkinson warned Robinson that he could not do too much to obtain the votes of Lord Abergavenny, the Duke of Beaufort, and

---

[1] A sensation had already been caused when George III had refused to confer the Order of the Bath on Mr. Beilby Thompson, a friend of Fox. The latter had heard of the death of Eyre Coote and had awarded his friend the honour without explicit word from the King, who preferred to await official news of Coote's death. Wraxall, *Memoirs*, vol. 3, pp. 149–50.

[2] Buckingham, *Courts and Cabinets of George III*, vol. 1, p. 283.

[3] Add. MSS. 37835, f. 203, 11 Nov., 1783. Robinson's Minutes.

[4] Wraxall, *Memoirs*, vol. 3, p. 433. Atkinson was a rum contractor to the army, and an East Indian proprietor connected with Benfield. He was always linked with Jenkinson. Cf. "Rolliad," *Of either Kinson, At or Jen.* Jenkinson had married Amelia, the daughter of "Nabob" William Watts.

Lord Montagu. " I hope to-morrow," he added, " to see your list of peers." By 8 December their canvass of the Lords was evidently completed,[1] and within three days from that date the King summoned Lord Temple. The latter departed from the King bearing a paper authorising him to say that, " whoever voted for the India Bill was not only not the King's friend but would be considered by him as an enemy." The effect was instantaneous and on the 15th an adjournment was carried against the Ministers by a majority of eight. That night Pitt, Robinson, Atkinson, and Dundas met secretly at the latter's house in Leicester Square, and Robinson submitted evidence to prove to Pitt that it was a feasible matter, in the event of the defeat of the Bill, to procure the support of a majority in the House of Commons.[2] Three days later the Lords had rejected Fox's Bill by a majority of nineteen votes and the King had dismissed his Ministers and appointed Pitt to lead a new administration.[3] For the first time in parliamentary history India affairs had fundamentally altered the course of politics at home.[4]

The delight of the chartered bodies knew no bounds; the East India Company publicly thanked the City of London for its help; [5] the City of London thanked the King. The " triumphant " Company published a caricature, " The Fall of Carlo Khan," in which Fox, unseated from his elephant, is falling to the ground with the words " Secret Influence " in his mouth, and Burke is running away at top speed. The " grateful " Company elected Richard Atkinson and his right-hand man George Johnstone as Directors in the places of Jacob Wilkinson and Sir Henry Fletcher, who felt that the India House was getting too uncomfortable to be safe.[1] Had the Directors but known it, Atkinson and Robinson had again begun to plot, and the former was already telling the latter, "We are to have a committee and a General Court to-morrow when we must lay our groundwork." [2]

---

[1] H.M.C., Abergavenny MSS., Rep. 10, App. 6, p. 62.

[2] *Robinson Papers*, ed. Laprade, p. 105.

[3] A virtual vote of censure on the King's act was passed in the Commons by 153 votes to 80. *Parl. Hist.*, 24, col. 196, 17 Dec., 1783.

[4] The statement that " until near the end of the century the Company was above the turmoil of party politics " is manifestly wrong. *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. 6, p. 550.

[5] *General Court Minutes*, vol. 6, f. 307, 20 Dec., 1783, I.O.

Atkinson, in fact, was going to have no easy task in moulding the views of the Directors and Proprietors to Robinson's liking. Major Scott, in reply to an attack by Burke, published figures intended to prove that "of the thirty or more members of all classes of India members in the Parliament of 1780, eighteen voted with the Coalition, eight with Pitt, and four were absent." [3] His conclusion cannot be demonstrated accurate but an interpretation of the evidence that Robinson has left tends to show that prior to the election in April, 1784, the Coalition included substantially as many "India members" as its adversaries. This statement needs qualification, for neither is the evidence left by Robinson, for example, necessarily accurate, nor is the estimate of the dates given to each of Robinson's lists necessarily correct.[4] The information given by Robinson about any particular member in any case represents a dominant trend rather than a positive alignment. In his first list which was made, perhaps, sometime between 8 December and 15 December, 1783, and which represents the probable attitude of the members of the House as it existed at that time, it is surprising to find that of the thirty-four "Nabobs" and Directors then in the House only twelve or thirteen are considered as "pro" or "hopeful" for Pitt, whereas sixteen or seventeen are recorded as being friendly to the Coalition.[5] Of the Directors, no less than five were actually in office in 1783, and of these we know definitely that Fletcher, Wilkinson, and Lushington supported Fox. If Robinson is to be relied on in the given circumstances, and we must note that the scanty information that exists apart from his Memoranda tends to support his evidence,[1] the amount of influence the Ministry could bring to bear on the India House is rendered plain. Moreover, the statement that the "East India Company interest, always powerful in politics, but recently split into conflicting factions, became united for the time being by what seemed a danger to their common interests," and so reinforced the supporters of the King and the remnants of the old Chatham party under Pitt against Fox, will not be strictly correct.[2] The retirement of the chairman of the Company, Sir Henry Fletcher, and another director, Jacob Wilkinson, just before 17 December, in any case suggests that the East India Company interest was by no means united. The whole of Robinson's evidence is, however, conjectural, and is further qualified by the fact that he dealt only in "personalities and methods of manipulation familiar to him from past experience"; not once does he refer to the supposed unpopularity of the Coalition or to the excited state of the public mind.[3]

---

[1] *Annual Register*, 1784, p. 177.

[2] H.M.C., Abergavenny MSS., Rep. 10, App. 6, p. 64, 8 Dec., 1783.

[3] *Public Advertiser*, 8 July, 1784. The statement that "the Bills were bitterly opposed by the Company and *all* the Indian interest" (*C.H. India*, vol. v, p. 195), is probably wrong.

[4] *Robinson's Parliamentary Papers*, ed. Laprade, p. 65.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 66–105.

The Pitt Ministry which came into office and which included a number of Lords all professing friendship for Hastings was termed by Lord Gower, the new President of the Council, "the Hastings' Administration"; it was declared in the newspapers that Hastings had overturned the Coalition and that Pitt owed his office to him.[4] In Parliament, Fox, although he might have held Pitt in the hollow of his hand, made the tactical error of opposing a dissolution.

---

[1] According to the two or three relevant voting lists that exist, Robinson's estimates in his second list at any rate appear for the most part correct.

[2] *Robinson's Parliamentary Papers*, ed. Laprade, p. xiii; Laprade's article, E.H.R., vol. 31, p. 225, "Public opinion and the 1784 election."

[3] *Ibid.*, p. xiv.

[4] Gleig, *Warren Hastings*, vol. 3, pp. 102–11.

The House separated for the Christmas holiday on 26 December to meet again on 12 January, 1784.

In taking office after the failure of Fox's India Bills Pitt was not actuated by the conviction that that Minister's proposals concerning India were so fundamentally wrong that they would arouse protest and so win him support. His subsequent Indian policy proved this, but it also proved that Pitt was clever enough to have seen in what ways Fox had erred. The latter had almost ignored the Company whilst drawing up his Bills, but Pitt, through the mediation of Robinson and Atkinson, was in constant touch with the Directors of the Company throughout the vacation. It was obvious to everyone concerned that the House of Commons had resolved that it was indispensably necessary that immediate measures should be taken to reform the Indian Government and Pitt quickly responded to the demand. The Company, after it had got over its first surprise, was more than ready to meet Pitt half-way. On 5 January, Pitt conferred with the Company's representatives, Nathaniel Smith, Richard Atkinson, Sulivan, and William Devaynes [1]; on the 6th, they reported to the Directors, and after a resolution had been passed " to confide in the wisdom of parliament for an effectual relief," the negotiations were completed.[2] Two days later the General Court gave its assent to the preliminary articles of the Bill. As early as 14 January, Pitt introduced, in a very able speech, his measure into Parliament. He pointed out to the Commons that the articles of the Bill were founded on resolutions of the Proprietors' Court, and that he was acting by consent and not by violence; he intimated that his plan might be condemned as a half-measure but that he himself considered this no aspersion. On the 23rd of January the Bill was thrown out on its second reading by a majority of 222 votes to 214 [3]; it was significant that the majority against Pitt was only 8. Constitutionally right, but tactically wrong, Fox helped to keep off the dissolution of Parliament until March; by then, however, he was no longer sure of a majority and the rate at which members had been drifting across to Pitt foretold the result of the general election.

---

[1] Chatham MSS. 353, P.R.O.

[2] *Ibid.*, 102, 169.

[3] *Parl. Hist.*, 24, col. 412. Cf. Fox's plea that his " Bill was not a child of choice but of necessity." *Parl. Hist.*, 23, col. 1262.

If Pitt was fairly sure of success in the forthcoming Parliament, he, or rather his henchmen, Robinson and Atkinson, were not at all convinced that they could keep the support of the Directors of the Company. Francis and Fox were bringing pressure to bear on their supporters and a hard struggle was in prospect at the election of the Directors[1]; the filling of the chairs was of the utmost importance. Atkinson invoked the aid of Laurence Sulivan; the latter wrote, "I had made a resolution of never more filling the 'chairs,' but the pressing wish of my friends may possibly force me back in April, if (as is suggested), Mr. Pitt should make the request."[2] A month later Sulivan turned difficult on the question of ministerial influence among the Directors, and Atkinson wrote to Robinson after the election of the six Directors to say[3]:

> We cannot request Sulivan to take the chair and support him if elected; so after all that has been done, after overturning a Ministry for invading the India constitution, Mr. Pitt must bring in a coercive regulation very similar in its principle to Mr. Fox's or remain a silent spectator of a scene of stupidity and inefficiency. There will be difficulty in carrying the "chairs" for Baring and me, even with Sulivan's best assistance!

On 19 April "the old gentleman" was "still immovable"; on the 20th Sulivan stood after all.[4] Atkinson told Robinson on the following day, "We should have lost it by one. Having determined that Sulivan should never be trusted in the chair we brought back the old 'chairs.'"[1] This meant that Pitt could, if necessary, get his own way again.

---

[1] *H. Walpole's Letters*, ed. Toynbee, to Sir H. Mann, vol. 13, p. 143, 15 April, 1784.

[2] Add. MSS. 29162, f. 294. Sulivan to Hastings, 1 March, 1784.

[3] Robinson was disappointed when only three Pittites, Baring, Boehm, and Mesurier, were returned against Fox's three, Inglis, Manship and Motteux. *Home Misc.*, 764, f. 683, 14 April, 1784, I.O.

[4] Sulivan was at this time about 70 years old.

Robinson's Memoranda for the election of 1784 bear an interesting statement: "Parliamentary state of boroughs and situations with remarks, . . . and a wild wide calculate of money wanted for seats, but which I always disapproved and thought very wrong."[2] Here, perhaps, Robinson was expressing his fear at the prospect of an organised buying of seats on the part of the Company's commercial magnates to the evident extinction of other and long-established interests. It evidently worried Robinson that he, in particular, should be concerned in the organisation of this hunt for seats. Nevertheless his fears did not stop him from approaching the "Nabobs" and magnates in question,[3] nor Pitt from gathering subscriptions from them,[4] and persuading the Company to oppose Fox at Westminster.[5] Atkinson was accused by Burke of keeping "a sort of public office or counting house where the whole business of the general election was managed," but the House was incredulous, and Pitt did not deign to make a statement.[6] Whatever were the steps that Robinson or Atkinson took, sixteen Directors and nineteen "Nabobs" were elected Members of Parliament, but they were not, of course, all supporters of Pitt[7]; conflict still took place within the Company. The Southwark by-election of 1784 exemplified this. One candidate, Paul le Mesurier, who was a supporter of Pitt, announced that he had been called to the office of Director of the Company "although the friends of Fox and North tried to keep me out." His opponent, Sir

---

[1] H.M.C., Abergavenny MSS., Rep. 10, App. 6, pp. 67–71. Nath. Smith and Devaynes were the "chairs."

[2] *Robinson's Parliamentary Papers*, ed. Laprade, p. 106.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 126–9.

[4] *Letters of Wm. Wilberforce*, p. 6.

[5] *Parl. Hist.*, 24, col. 842, 24 May, 1784; *H. Walpole Letters*, vol. 13, p. 139, to Sir H. Mann, 30 March, 1784.

[6] *Parl. Hist.*, 25, col. 250, 28 Feb., 1785.

[7] See *Robinson's Parliamentary Papers*, pp. 107–9 and 128, for prices members of the East India interest were prepared to pay for seats.

Richard Hotham, a managing owner of East India ships, supported the Coalition. Despite attempts to play upon "M'sieu'" le Mesurier's origin—he came from Guernsey—the final vote was 935 to 924 in his favour.[1] Sheridan and Burke both affected to believe that their fight for reform had been untainted by Indian support, a monopoly of which they imputed to their opponents, yet Sheridan's colleague in the representation of Stafford, elected in partnership with him, was the "Nabob," Edward Monckton.[2]

Great as was the part played by the Company in the general election, it was still vastly overestimated by the supporters of the Coalition. Their "scribblers" variously estimated the number of India members, or connections of India members, elected, at from 64 to 104.[3] In 1771 the "Nabobs" had been accused of having formed a club for the purpose of buying boroughs,[4] and now a "Bengal Club" was accused of having elected 74 members for Pitt. The Club in question issued a statement denying that it had taken any part in politics and explaining that its members were men of opposite opinions.[5]

The Bengal Club met "once a fortnight for six months in the year" at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, when friendships "formed during many years abroad" were rekindled.[6] It is not impossible that this Club was an offshoot of Clive's "East Indian Club," because the latter had consisted originally of "Nabobs" from Bengal. We must differentiate between the "Bengal Club" and the so-called "Bengal Squad," though it is difficult to believe that the former could have separated itself entirely from politics. The numbers of the " Squad," which rose to prominence between the years 1780 and 1784, were not insignificant. " The election of Mr. Rum Atkinson's friend, Sir Samuel Hannay, for Camelford adds one more member to the ' Bengal Squad ' in the House of Commons." [1] Contemporary accounts of the members, and even of the leaders, of the " Squad " vary: one account calls Major John Scott the leader, another, Robert Palk: the most prominent members besides those already named appear to have been Benfield, Macpherson, Wraxall, Sulivan, Call, Barwell, Middleton, Smith and Vansittart.[2] The members of the Squad were often identified with Hastings' friends and they were not necessarily Members of Parliament. Robinson lists the Indian group mobilised to aid Pitt: Hastings, Barwell, Darell, Wraxall, Atkinson, Sykes, John Cator, and Sir Samuel Hannay.[3] Burke wrote in December, 1791, " The East Indians have united themselves into one great and in my opinion formidable club, which though now quiet may be brought into action with considerable unanimity and force." [4] Discounting Burke's natural tendency on the subject of India to exaggerate it is evident that the " Bengal Squad " was a powerful force.

---

[1] *Public Advertiser*, 21 and 28 June, 1784.

[2] *Parl. Hist.*, 24, col. 1201, 26 July, 1784; *Public Advertiser*, 20 Sept., 1783.

[3] *Public Advertiser*, 8 June, 6 July, 7 Aug., 1784. Scott said no East Indian had returned two members. Benfield did not, and, with the exception of Barwell who is down for two seats (p. 126), there is no evidence to the contrary in Robinson's Papers.

[4] *Town and Country Magazine*, 1771, p. 69.

[5] *Public Advertiser*, 27 May, 8 July, 1784.

[6] *Public Advertiser*, 27 May, 1784.

In 1787 one observer estimated that Mr. Hastings' " friends " in the House numbered thirty or forty members [5]: in the following year a group of fifteen " East Indians " is recorded as supporting Pitt.[6] According to the evidence of Robinson's second list, which attempted to indicate the attitude of the members of a new Parliament elected after a dissolution preceded by the dismissal of Fox and the accession of Pitt, ten " Nabobs " and nine Directors are forecast as probable supporters of Administration, whilst four "Nabobs" and two Directors are evidently supporters of the Coalition.[1] Robinson's evidence is too vague accurately to estimate whether any "Nabobs" or Directors crossed over from Fox to Pitt.

---

[1] *Morning Herald* and *Daily Advertiser*, 26 July, 1784.

[2] " Rolliad," *Political Eclogues. Jekyll*, ll. 60–70. *Probationary Ode by Scott*, verse 5.

[3] *Robinson's Parliamentary Papers*, ed. Laprade, pp. 126–9.

[4] *Burke's Works*, ed. Bohn, vol. 3, p. 354.

[5] H.M.C., Rutland MSS., Rep. 14, App. 1, 8 Feb., 1787, pp. 368–9.

[6] *Ibid.*, Smith MSS., Rep. 12, App. 9, p. 373.

When tempers roused by the struggle between Fox and Pitt had cooled, and when minds clouded by the turbulence of the general election had cleared, Pitt re-introduced his India Bill into the Commons (26 July, 1784). The Bill neither excited the interest and opposition nor produced the attendances that the recent India Bills had done. This is partly accounted for by the fact that Pitt's Bill was avowedly a compromise, and that the majority of the "East India interest" had thrown in its lot with him.[2] The meekness with which the Company accepted this measure compared with the boldness, even desperation, with which it had opposed Fox's Bills is very noticeable, but not surprising. "Considering the madness and prejudices of men in general with respect to India, Pitt's propositions are very fair."[3] In December, 1783, too, it had seemed the custom, perhaps on the analogy of the merits of their fathers, never to censure Fox without praising Pitt. Pitt's purity of motive was not doubted for a moment, but his speeches on his own India Bill naturally came as a shock to a Company that had listened with joy to his orations against Fox's plan.[4] Nevertheless, the "East Indians" could not easily retreat without being charged with treachery, and, moreover, there was no third party to retreat to.[5] But Pitt was not hard on the Company: he consulted it, he compromised with it; he was even ready to accept amendments from his opponents.

---

[1] According to the two relevant voting lists, Robinson's estimates are mainly correct. Of the Directors and "Nabobs," Purling's and Farrer's votes alone provide conflicting evidence.

[2] Pitt's concession to his East India friends annoyed the country gentlemen. H.M.C., Rutland MSS., Rep. 14, App. 1, 13 Aug., 1784, p. 131. D. Pultney to Rutland.

[3] Scott to Hastings, Gleig, vol. 3, p. 110. Sulivan echoed this, "Whether we shall be a Company rests upon a Pitt or a Fox being Minister." Add. MSS. 29162, f. 131, 12 Feb., 1784.

[4] *General Court Minutes*, vol. 6, f. 334.

[5] *Real Situation of the E.I. Co.*, Geo. Tierney, pp. 3–44. London, 1787.

Pitt's Second Bill, in fact, differed more in form than in substance from that of Fox's, and, while it avoided placing Indian patronage avowedly in the hands of an English minister, it, in reality, gave him perhaps even more power than the previous bill. The Company's home government, consisting of the Courts of Directors and Proprietors, remained, but over them was placed a Board of Control appointed by the King, and consisting of one of the Secretaries of State, the Chancellor of the Exchequer and four other members of the Privy Council. This body, which was unpaid and had no patronage, was empowered to control the whole civil and military government of the Company. A Committee of Secrecy of not more than three members was to be formed out of the Directors, which, when necessary, was secretly to transmit orders to India from the Board. The Court of Proprietors lost much of its power, but the Directors retained their control over the commercial patronage and commercial administration of the Company. The authority of the Governor-General and Council over the subordinate Presidencies of Madras and Bombay was greatly enlarged and numerous internal regulations relating to India, substantially adopted from Fox's Bills, were included.[1] The Bill was opposed chiefly on the grounds of the immense accession of power which the establishment of the Board of Control must give to the Crown, but the scorn and virulence in Fox's speeches did not move the House, and the Bill passed on 26 July by a huge majority.[2]

The principles behind the Bill, that no Company of merchants could govern India, and that no violent interference with the commercial interests of the Company was advisable, formed an eloquent commentary on the previous thirty years of the Company's history. "Fox's measure apart from the manner in which its omnipotent Seven Commissioners were chosen, had much to commend it, yet so violent a break with the past as the almost total extinction of the East India Company would not, perhaps, have been for the best interests of India." Pitt's Bill, though in some respects inferior to Fox's, aimed at the "golden mean," and so preserved the continuity of the Company's history. Its first result was the resignation of Hastings, and thus it marked the end of a well-defined period in the Company's history both in India and in England. On the whole the system of "double government" established by the Act of 1784 continued to direct Indian affairs until the abolition of the Company in 1858. Finally, in 1784, the East India "interest" had discovered that it could become a potent factor in politics; the "Nabobs" and the Company's merchants had paved the way for the industrial capitalists following in their wake: "the dénouement of 1832 was in prospect."

---

[1] Grant-Robertson, *Select Statutes, Cases and Documents*, pp. 260–72.

[2] *Parl. Hist.*, 24, col. 1215.

RANULF DE GERNONS, EARL OF CHESTER, 1129–1153

By H. A. Cronne, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.

Read 13 *May*, 1937

It is with the greatest diffidence that I venture to present a paper upon a subject which has attracted the attention of a line of eminent historians and genealogists, but still remains one of the most obscure in twelfth-century history. No subject could be more tantalising for an historian than the career of Ranulf de Gernons, fourth earl of Chester. Its importance is manifest in the history of the palatine earldom; in the history of a great Welsh resurgence; in the history of Stephen's England, where the extent of the earl's hereditary possessions and his policy of self-aggrandisement and consistent inconstancy made him a dominating factor in the political and military situation; and above all it is of absorbing interest to the student of feudalism.[1]

To all appearance there is no lack of material for the study. The chroniclers' references to Ranulf are as many and as full as one can reasonably expect them to be; his surviving charters are far more numerous than those of any of his contemporaries, and are interesting both diplomatically and for the study of political relations and feudal conditions; those of other magnates who moved within his sphere are not lacking in references to him[2]; and the concessions which he wrung from Stephen and Henry

---

[1] See F. M. Stenton, *The First Century of English Feudalism*, *passim*.

[2] E.g. an agreement made by a tenant of the earl of Warwick with Reading Abbey "anno quo Randulfus comes Cestrie me venantem cepit." Stenton, *op. cit.*, p. 243.

Plantagenet are without parallel. But his career presents a baffling series of problems which are rather complicated than elucidated by the available evidence. Some turn upon points of genealogy and of feudal law and custom which are still obscure; some upon questions of date (in the majority of such cases it is impossible to discover for the relevant charters limitations sufficiently narrow to be definitive); and in all of them lack of some vital information leaves an uncomfortably wide field for conjecture. This paper is, then, a confession of failure, in that it neither adds appreciably to our historical knowledge of Ranulf's career, nor does it offer a satisfactory solution of the problems connected with it. Much has been written about these problems individually, but Ranulf's career as a whole has scarcely received the attention it merits. It seems worth while to attempt to place it in perspective and to examine the problems as they arise, even though it is impossible to progress in their solution beyond the stage of conjecture.

Ranulf was born before 1109: probably about 1105. His parentage raises a problem whose complicated meshes it is impossible entirely to avoid, and which, if it could be solved, would provide a clue to the solution of several others. His mother was that singular personage, the countess Lucy. Much ink has been spilt over the question of whether there was but a single Lucy, or two Lucys, mother and daughter. The probability seems to be that there was only one, and certainly there can have been only one *countess* Lucy. Her parentage constitutes a still more intricate problem, the crux of which is her relationship to the obscure but notorious Thorold the Sheriff.[1] A solution of this problem would, no doubt, throw a flood of light upon the claims of Ranulf and his half-brother, William de Roumare, in Lincoln. It seems, for example, just within the bounds of possibility that one of them might have inherited through their mother colourable claims to the shrievalty of Lincolnshire and with it the constableship of the castle, for the two offices were sometimes held together, and feudal ambition aimed at making them hereditary. William de Roumare subsequently became earl of Lincoln and, for a time at any rate, royal justiciar in that shire with, apparently, authority over the city of Lincoln [1]; but, as far as the evidence goes, it is always Ranulf who appears as the claimant to Lincoln Castle.

---

[1] On this whole question, see: T. Stapleton, *Hist. of the Norman Exch.*, ii. p. cliii; J. G. Nichols, *Topographer and Genealogist*, i. pp. 12 ff.; Freeman, *Norman Conq.*, ii. p. 682; R. E. G. Kirk, *Genealogist*, N.S. iv. and v.; J. H. Round, *Academy*, Dec., 1887, and *Feudal England*, pp. 254 n., 328–9; W. Farrer, *Honours and Knights' Fees*, ii. p. 154; R. Eyton, *Collections for Lincolnshire*, B.M. Add. MS. 31929, fo. 68vo; *The Complete Peerage* (ed. Gibbs).

Lucy's mother was a daughter of William Malet. See B.M. Cotton, ch. xvii. 2.

Lucy married as her first husband Ivo de Taillebois, but no issue survived. The issue of her second marriage to Roger fitz Gerald (de Roumare), was a son, William de Roumare, born about 1100.[2] Soon after the death of her second husband, when their son was still a minor, Lucy married Ranulf, called le Meschin, hereditary vicomte of Bayeux and lord of the honour of Carlisle. Upon the death of his cousin, Richard d'Avranches, earl of Chester, in the White Ship, Henry I bestowed the earldom upon Ranulf. The actual details of this transaction are by no means clear. It has constantly been asserted that, as the price of succession, Henry obliged him to surrender the honour of Carlisle. Dugdale, to whom the statement can be traced, based it upon a misinterpretation of a marginal note in one of the manuscripts of Matthew of Westminster, and there appears to be no other authority for it.[3] None the less, the fact remains that Ranulf did at some time lose Carlisle. Further, according to Orderic, Henry exacted from him the dowery and inheritance of his wife, and the wardship of his stepson's lands. In the Pipe Roll of 31 Hen. I Geoffrey de

---

[1] Foster, *Reg. Antiquissimum of Linc. Cathedral*, i. p. 60; Stenton, *op. cit.*, p. 225 n. 1.

[2] Farrer, *Early Yorks. Charters*, ii. p. 195.

[3] See Matthew Paris, *Chron. Maj.* (ed. Luard), ii. p. 8 n.

Clinton, one of the king's "new men," accounts for £8 13*s.* 8*d.* of the old ferm of William de Roumare's lands. In the same Roll the countess Lucy accounts in Lincolnshire for £266 13*s.* 4*d.* for her father's land, of which she pays £166 13*s.* 4*d.* She owes in addition 500 marks that she may not be given in marriage for five years, 45 marks for this favour, to be paid to whom the king will, and 100 marks that she may "hold right" in her court (of Bolingbroke) between her men. Finally, when William de Roumare claimed his inheritance in 1122 Henry refused to restore it to him.[1] Undoubtedly the king had considerable justification for his treatment of the countess Lucy's husband and son. With his inherent suspicion of potentially dangerous men he must have feared not only any augmentation of the already enormous honour of Chester, but the creation of an over-powerful family bloc. The honour of Chester, as the first Ranulf held it, comprised tenements in twenty-two shires outside the palatine county.[2] Of these the most significant strategically were the earl's Lincolnshire fiefs and a series of tenements clustering around the northern borders of Leicestershire and the southern confines of Nottingham and Derbyshire along the upper waters of the Trent, and a few small and scattered estates in Staffordshire. To these would have been added by Ranulf I's marriage with the countess Lucy a not inconsiderable dowery in Lincolnshire—probably those twenty knights' fees "of the fee of Thorold the sheriff" upon which the earl of Chester paid scutage in 1165 [3]—together with Lucy's own fee of Bolingbroke and the wardship of William de Roumare's patrimony in Lincolnshire and elsewhere and, we may suppose, the reversion of certain hereditary claims in the shire and castle of Lincoln. It is perhaps reading history backwards to suggest that Henry I saw in this great agglomeration of lands, with their twin centres in Chester and Lincoln and their line of communication across the Midlands, the nucleus of a formidable strategical position coinciding with the geographical division between northern and southern England. It is, at all events, a clear instance in which the scattering of baronial lands bade fair to produce results far different from those which historians once attributed to it; and it is interesting to speculate whether Henry was as conscious of the danger as Stephen was made painfully conscious of it, and whether he laid down the lines of a policy which there are indications that Stephen strove, at one stage, to follow—a policy of maintaining a balance of power by increasing the influence of the Beaumont family in the Midlands.[1]

---

[1] Ordericus Vitalis, *Hist. Eccl.*, bk. xii, ch. xxxiv.

[2] See W. Farrer, *Hons. and Kts'. Fees*, ii.

[3] Round, *Feudal England*, p. 254 n.

The treatment which Henry meted out to Ranulf le Meschin and William de Roumare are characteristic of a policy which left the feudatories seething with discontent, and constituted a very evil legacy for his weaker and less able successor. The earl of Chester seems to have been complaisant enough, but his stepson flew into rebellion and joined the faction of William Clito in Normandy. His reconciliation with the king and his reception into high favour, which Orderic places in 1128, are equally characteristic of a monarch who, when circumstances dictated it, spared no pains to win a man who might do him a service or an injury.

Upon the death of his father in 1129 Ranulf de Gernons fell heir to an honour whose vast extent I have already indicated in broad terms; of whose strategical possibilities, as his subsequent career shows, he was well aware; and to claims, and the support of his half-brother's claims, in Lincoln, whose potentialities he appreciated to the full. He inherited in addition a sense of grievance in respect of the treatment his parents had received at the hands of the crown, and a debt of £1,000 which his father still owed for the fief of his cousin, Richard d'Avranches, besides other sums, making a total of about £1,600. It is not surprising to find in the Pipe Roll that he was indebted to the Jews. In particular he was filled with resentment at the loss of his father's honour of Carlisle. But during the few remaining years of Henry's reign he remained quiescent, and the only knowledge we have of his participation in affairs is of a visit to the king's court at Northampton in 1131. Presumably he took the oath to Maud in that year when it was exacted from the baronage for the second time—not that it weighed very heavily upon their consciences. A considerable number of his charters belong to these early years, and he was probably engaged in setting his house in order.

---

[1] See H. W. C. Davis, *The Beaumonts and the Leicester Earldom*, in *Essays Presented to R. L. Poole*, p. 176.

The man was haughty and proud; touchy upon the point of honour, but faithless and utterly untrammelled by any scruple in the pursuit of his ends; determined as a spoilt child to gratify his desires and ambitions, but, lacking subtlety, he did so by the simplest, most obvious and most direct methods. "He was," says Henry of Huntingdon in the speech which he puts into the mouth of Baldwin fitz Gilbert before the battle of Lincoln,

> a man audacious but lacking in judgement; heady to plot treason, but wavering in pursuit of it; ready to dash into battle and reckless of all danger; aiming beyond his reach; striving after the unattainable . . . for whatsoever he begins like a man he ends like a woman; unfortunate in all his undertakings, in his encounters he has either been defeated or, if by chance he obtains an occasional victory, it is with greater loss to himself than to the conquered.

Taking this for the partisan speech it professes to be, it agrees remarkably well with the known facts of his career, save that the unattainable became astonishingly practicable in his unscrupulous hands, and we are left with an unwholesome awe of the deadly qualities of the "female of the species" in the twelfth century.

Ranulf's friendship with his half-brother, who was obviously devoted to him, is very striking. They always acted in the closest co-operation, of which one curious monument survives in a charter of William de Roumare, addressed to all kings, prelates, clergy and sons of Holy Church, testifying that he is a witness to, and perhaps in some sort a guarantor of, a gift made by Ranulf, on his advice, to Minting Priory.[1]

Before 1135 Ranulf married Matilda, daughter of Robert, earl of Gloucester, half-brother of the Empress and leader of the Angevin faction in England. It may be unwise to draw psychological conclusions from the wording of legal documents ; but it seems worthy of note that in a grant in soul-alms to the canons of Repton the countess of Chester not only includes the Empress in the beneficiary clause, but refers to her, not as her kinswoman, but as her friend.[2] It would seem that Ranulf's wife was bound to the Angevin cause not merely by birth but by a tie of personal friendship with the Empress. His marriage, then, gave Ranulf a footing in the Angevin camp, but he offended his father-in-law by his complete indifference to the cause. Not only so, but William of Malmesbury, the panegyrist of the earl of Gloucester, seems to imply that he held Ranulf in contempt for his lack of principles and refusal to give his loyalty to any cause whatsoever.[3] Stubbs asserted that " the earl of Chester, though when he prevailed upon himself to act, he took part against Stephen, fought rather on his own account than on Matilda's." [4] The first part of this statement is not strictly accurate, for there were two occasions, viz. in 1141 and 1146, when he thought it politic to appear in arms in support of Stephen ; and his career is not marked by the hesitancy which Stubbs's statement seems to imply : but the essential truth remains that he fought consistently on his own account and on no other.

---

[1] " Omnibus Regibus, Archiepiscopis, Episcopis, Abbatibus, clericis et omnibus filiis sancte eccelsie tocius Anglie, Willelmus de Romara, Comes Lincolnie, salutem et honorem. Sciatis pro vero quod testis sum donacionis quam comes Ranulphus cestrie, frater meus, consilio meo fecit monachis sancti Benedicti et sancti Jacobi apud Minting', de omni dominio suo quod habuit in Minting', scilicet in terris et gardino, pratis, pasturis, et in bosco, nominatim sicut carta quam de Comite Rannulpho habent eis testatur. Testibus: Rogero de Tailbol [*sic*] et Gilberto bolonie, Matheo Bemgelwade, Willelmo et Rogero capellanis et Radulpho filio Herberti, apud Minting'." *Reg. of Spalding*, B.M. Add. MS. 35296, fo. 411.

[2] Jeayes, *Derbyshire Charters*, no. 1943.

[3] W. Malmesb., *Historia Novella* (R.S.), ii. p. 570.

[4] Stubbs, *Const. Hist.* (1926 impr.), i. p. 355.

Round pointed out long since in the brief, pregnant article which he devoted to Ranulf's career,[1] that the springs of his policy are to be found in Carlisle and Lincoln, and that it seems to have been his ambition to " reign at Lincoln as he reigned at Chester, and to unite these strongholds by a chain of fortresses securing his dominion from sea to sea."

The first of these ambitions received an early set-back in Stephen's reign for, in February, 1136, at the close of the first Scottish war, Stephen ceded Carlisle, *inter alia*, to Henry, son of David king of Scots. Although David refused officially to countenance his son's homage to Stephen, he was nothing loath to profit by it, and took over the actual government of Carlisle.[2] Henry accompanied his overlord to the Easter court, where his treatment as an honoured guest gave rise to one of those scenes which were all too frequent at such assemblies. He was placed at the king's right hand, which gave offence to William, archbishop of Canterbury ; while his very presence was gall and wormwood to the earl of Chester, whose claim to Carlisle had been overridden in his favour. The insulting behaviour of the archbishop and the earl led to his withdrawal from court, and gave the king of Scots a not unwelcome pretext for renewed aggression. It is interesting to observe that Ranulf takes precedence of Henry in the only charter which both of them attest.[3]

His duties as earl palatine of Chester next demanded Ranulf's attention. The beginning of a Welsh resurgence drew him with an army into north Wales where he was ambushed and barely escaped with his life.[1]

---

[1] Round, *Stephen and the Earl of Chester*, E.H.R., x. pp. 87 ff.

[2] See Sir A. C. Lawrie, *Early Scottish Charters*, nos. cxxiii. and cxxvi.

[3] Charter to Winchester. See Round, *Geoffrey de Mandeville*, p. 262.

The years 1137–8 were marked by renewed Scottish attacks. It might be expected that Ranulf, burning to recover Carlisle, would have been prominent in the war; but in fact he seems to have played the part of a sulking Achilles. There is no record of his presence at the battle of the Standard, which should have been decisive and was not, because it was not in the interests of the northern baronage that it should be so. Hostilities dragged on for several months, and were brought to a close, largely through the instrumentality of the papal legate and the queen, on terms which were ultimately embodied in the treaty of Durham in April, 1139. This treaty appears to have been carried in the teeth of considerable baronial opposition.[2] Unfortunately Richard of Hexham, the only chronicler who mentions the circumstance, gives no inkling of who the opponents of the treaty were, beyond suggesting that they were losers by it; and we can only say that the earl of Chester seems to have had more cause than anyone else to resent it. The terms included the grant of the earldom of Northumberland, with the significant exceptions of Newcastle and Bamborough, to Henry of Scotland, and the confirmation of the fiefs which he had received in 1136, including, of course, Carlisle. As far as can be discerned from the evidence, no question of the cession of the honour of Lancaster to the Scots arose at this time.[3] It has been suggested, however, that David, king of Scots, took up his residence at Carlisle, with a view, perhaps, to making it his southern capital, and that he built the great keep of the castle and strengthened the city walls.[4]

---

[1] John of Hexham (R.S.), p. 287.

[2] Richard of Hexham (R.S.), p. 176.

[3] See J. Tait, *Medieval Manchester and the Beginnings of Lancashire*, p. 166; H. A. Cronne, *The Honour of Lancaster in Stephen's Reign*, E.H.R., l. pp. 670 ff.

[4] *V.C.H., Cumberland*, ii. p. 242; *Notes and Queries*, 8th S., viii. pp. 521–3. See also M. F. Moore, *Lands of the Scottish Kings in England.*

This renewed rebuff to Ranulf's ambitions was aggravated by the marriage which Stephen arranged between Henry of Scotland and Adeline, daughter of William de Warenne, who was the half-brother of Waleran and Robert de Beaumont.[1] At this time Stephen seems to have been hand-in-glove with the Beaumonts,[2] the distribution of whose Midland fiefs made them rivals and potential enemies of the earl of Chester. Waleran became earl of Worcester about 1138[3]; Robert was earl of Leicester, and received Hereford, though not as earl, probably about 1140[4]; Hugh became lord of Bedford, which, however, he lost three years later[5]; and Roger, cousin of these three brothers, was earl of Warwick. In a word, Ranulf had been deeply affronted. Honours, dignities, earldoms, had been bestowed with a lavish hand upon the hated Scot who had filched his patrimony of Carlisle, and upon the Scot's new relations-in-law, the Beaumonts, whose growing power in the Midlands Ranulf must have regarded with a jealous eye. His first reaction was an outburst of childish fury, which sought an outlet in a hot-headed scheme—whose outcome, if it had succeeded, he cannot have seriously considered—to waylay Henry of Scots and his bride on their journey home from Stephen's court.[6]

It seems probable that one other grievance filled up the cup of Ranulf's resentment. William de Albini (Pincerna), the husband of Henry I's widow, who subsequently became earl of Sussex, appears as earl of Lincoln about 1139, and William de Roumare appears as earl of Cambridge about the same time.[7] The puzzle remains unsolved, but the facts are suggestive. The grant of the earldom of Lincoln to William de Albini was an affront which William de Roumare and his brother of Chester would find it very hard to forgive. William de Roumare had a claim upon Stephen's gratitude for his services as justiciar of Normandy; and the extent of his Lincolnshire fiefs—for he probably inherited his mother's honour of Bolingbroke about 1138—made a strong case for the priority of his claims to the earldom, if it were to be granted to anyone; while his rival had no lands in the shire at all. It may be that the earldom of Cambridge was given to him as a sop, but, if that was the case, it certainly did not pacify him. We might not be far wrong in believing that Stephen's tactlessness in this matter was one of the main causes of the first rebellion of William de Roumare and his brother, the earl of Chester.

---

[1] See G. H. White, *ante*, 4th Ser., xvii. p. 30.

[2] See Davis, *loc. cit.*

[3] White, *ante*, 4th Ser., xiii. p. 72.

[4] Davis, *loc. cit.*; White, *loc. cit.* The latter grant closely resembles the grant to Ranulf, earl of Chester, of Stafford and Staffordshire by Henry, Duke of Normandy, in 1153.

[5] White, *ante*, 4th Ser., xiii. pp. 77–82.

[6] Joh. Hexh., p. 306.

[7] See Round, *G. de M.*, pp. 324–5; *Feud. Eng.*, pp. 185–7; White, *ante*, 4th Ser., xiii. pp. 52–4; *Complete Peerage* (ed. Gibbs) under "Lincoln."

The sequence of the events which followed Ranulf's abortive attempt to capture Henry of Scots and his bride generally follows such lines as these:

> The earl threw in his lot with his half-brother, William of Roumare, who, though recently created earl of Lincoln by the king, was aggrieved that he had not also obtained the custody of Lincoln castle, which he claimed as of hereditary right. The two conspirators kept up the mask of friendship till the last. Stephen was their guest at Lincoln shortly before the mid-winter of 1140; as soon as he had turned southwards to keep his Christmas court at London they inaugurated their revolt by seizing the castle. It is an instructive comment on the current ideas of political obligation that their guilt was held to lie not so much in their defection from the lawful king, as in their omission to send him a message of defiance. Rebellion had ceased to be a crime, and all the earls of the northern counties, even those who owed their dignity to Stephen, began to waver in their allegiance.[1]

A number of statements in this account of the rebellion are not strictly accurate. In the first place, there is no conclusive evidence of William's tenure of the earldom of Lincoln prior to 1142.[1]

---

[1] Davis, *Normans and Angevins*, p. 168.

Secondly, the statement that the guilt of Ranulf and William lay in their omission to send the king a message of defiance is a misinterpretation of the words of William of Malmesbury, who, in actual fact, deprecates the conduct of Stephen in attacking the earls without defying them.[2] Malmesbury's account of the affair may be suspect, since the book with which it opens is dedicated to Robert, earl of Gloucester; but he is in the main an honest and reliable chronicler, and his statement is not contradicted elsewhere. Further, Ranulf, in the oration before the battle of Lincoln, which Henry of Huntingdon puts in his mouth, bitterly reviles "the perfidious king who has broken the truce he made."[3] In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, we must believe that it was the king and not the earls who was accused of a breach of faith and an infraction of the feudal law. Consequently the comment upon the current ideas of political obligation is inapplicable.

Finally, the northern earls may have wavered in their loyalty to Stephen, but a very creditable number of the leading magnates of the north remained with him on the stricken field of Lincoln.[4]

It is necessary to re-examine the circumstances under which Lincoln castle was seized. Ranulf and his half-brother had determined upon forceful action to obtain what they regarded as their rights: action for which an example and a precedent had been set by William de Roumare's brother-in-law, Baldwin de Redvers, whose seizure of Exeter castle and attempt to dominate the city had given the king his first taste of serious baronial turbulence, and an insight into the trend of feudal ambition in the ancient boroughs. Stephen, as Professor Stenton has pointed out, clung with admirable tenacity to his rights in borough and castle; and attempts to usurp them touched him shrewdly. Consequently, the seizure of Lincoln castle and the domination of that wealthy and strategically important city was a bold stroke, which, if it was delivered at the right moment, might well produce very gratifying results. Now, the Empress had landed in the autumn of 1139; a period of hectic campaigning ensued; the Angevin party was consolidating itself in the south-west, and a prolonged struggle seemed assured. The year 1140 was marked by fruitless negotiations and much military activity; by the revolt of the Bishop of Ely, and by an expedition against William fitz Richard of Cornwall, both of whom Stephen successfully suppressed. Then, before Christmas we learn of Stephen's visit to Lincoln, where he increased the honours of the earl of Chester and his brother,[1] and departed thence to London for the Christmas feast. This visit of conciliation was clearly of urgent importance since Stephen troubled to pay it before Christmas. I venture to suggest that it was caused by the seizure of the castle. The reason for this suggestion is twofold. In the first place, the favourable moment for the seizure of the castle by Ranulf and William occurred before Stephen's visit to Lincoln, at a time when he was faced by serious rebellion, and not after it, when he was comparatively free to deal with a new rebellion. Secondly, if we accept the view that Ranulf and William seized the castle after Stephen's visit, their subsequent conduct is extraordinarily difficult to understand, for it was not the conduct of rebels. We have it on Malmesbury's authority that they were dwelling securely in the castle, not in the least expecting the arrival of the king—and yet, the seizure of a royal castle was a flagrant act of rebellion which was bound to bring swift retribution unless the king was otherwise employed. They appear to have taken no military precautions whatsoever to secure their position, and they were taken unawares by Stephen's sudden arrival in the very days of the Christmas feast, in response to the urgent entreaties of the bishop and citizens of Lincoln. Ranulf escaped by the skin of his teeth, and the mobilisation of the relieving army, which routed and captured Stephen on 2 February, 1141, was the work of more than a month. In the circumstances, it was a rapid achievement; but if a rebellion had been planned one would expect some more effective military arrangements to have been made by the rebels to meet eventualities. To my mind these considerations point to the conclusion that Stephen had visited Lincoln after, and in consequence of, the seizure of the castle,[1] and that he had purchased the neutrality of the earl of Chester and his brother by liberal concessions, hoping, no doubt, to crush them when circumstances permitted. This view would seem to be supported by the evidence of the *Gesta Stephani*. Unfortunately a vital portion of this narrative is lost in a lacuna of two folios, and what remains of it begins in the middle of a sentence which, in the circumstances, is not a little cryptic.

---

[1] See note 7, p. 112. Round tentatively suggested in *Ancient Charters*, no. 23 n., that he might have received it before September, 1139; but the William of this charter may be William de Albini; and the suggestion is scarcely consonant with the views he expresses elsewhere.

[2] W. Malmesb., *Hist. Nov.* (R.S.), ii. p. 569.

[3] Hen. Hunt (R.S.), p. 268.

[4] W. Malmesb. (R.S.), ii. p. 571. Most of them had distinguished themselves at the Battle of the Standard. Stephen's supporters had not come to Lincoln prepared for a campaign, and they tried to persuade him to decline battle and withdraw to collect his forces. John of Hexham, p. 307.

---

[1] W. Malmesb. (R.S.), ii. p. 569.

> . . . daret totum quod deliquerat diligentius emendaturum. Quapropter consultum est regi, ut viro, ad foedus redintegrandum, ad pacem innovandam, recepto, si promissa factis adimpleret, tactius observaret, sicque ad alia explenda aliorsum secederet—*Gesta Stephani* (R.S.), p. 69.

This is, at any rate *prima facie*, evidence of an agreement of some kind. Furthermore, in continuing his narrative, the author of the *Gesta* makes no reference to the seizure of the castle, which he must have mentioned already; but says that the earl (of Chester), according to his wont, displayed no greater devotion to the king but dwelt in the castle with his family and oppressed the citizens of Lincoln, who therefore sent urgent appeals to Stephen to come to their assistance. It seems as though Stephen felt justified in making his surprise attack on Lincoln on the ground of Ranulf's breach of the spirit if not the letter of their agreement.

---

[1] This is the view which is taken, though without explanation, in *V.C.H.*, *Lincs.*, ii. p. 252.

There is no clue to the terms of this agreement. It may well be that it embraced the castle but not the city of Lincoln, and that the attempt by Ranulf and his brother to dominate the city constituted the breach. This would account for the indignation of the citizens who, but a decade earlier, had secured the right to hold the city of the king in chief.[1] It is possible, also, that William de Roumare received the earldom of Lincoln and, perhaps, the justiciarship of the shire.[2]

It may be that a somewhat obscure episode in the career of Alan, count of Brittany and so-called earl of Richmond, may have some bearing upon Stephen's relations with the earl of Chester at this time. Alan bore a reputation for "extreme truculence and cunning"[3] and was no friend of the church; though he is said to have become a reformed character at the end of his life. His retinue had played a prominent part in the events which led up to the arrest of the bishops in 1139; and in 1140 he seems to have been high in the royal favour, for Stephen granted Cornwall to him in that year.[4] Towards the close of 1140 he was engaged in ravaging the property of the archbishop of York in the district of Ripon, and in 1144 he was guilty of further sacrilege there,[5] conduct which seems to place him among the disturbers of the peace. Now, about the time that

---

[1] *Pipe Roll*, 31 *Hen. i.* (1929 ed.), p. 114, under "Nova Placita et Nove Conventiones."

[2] See note 1, p. 105.

[3] *Gesta*, pp. 64, 72.

[4] He was not made earl of Cornwall—see Farrer's *Early Yorks. Ch.* (ed. Clay), iv. pp. 15–16. On the question of his titles, see Round, *G. de M.*, p. 290, n. 2.

[5] Joh. Hexh, p. 306.

Lincoln castle was seized by the earl of Chester Alan captured the castle of "Galclint"—that is Gaultney Wood in Northamptonshire, close to Kettering [1]—by a night surprise, ejected William de Albini therefrom, and made himself master of a considerable treasure which the castle contained.[2] The person whom Alan thus ousted from Galclint must have been William de Albini Brito, lord of Belvoir,[3] whose lands were, for some reason, forfeited by Stephen at an unknown date.[4] Alan's seizure of Galclint may have been a mere attractive piece of aggression; but, in view of his relations with Stephen at the time, it may equally well be that William de Albini's forfeiture occurred towards the end of 1140, and that Alan was acting against a feudatory who had forfeited the royal protection.

To all appearance Alan played a none too creditable part at the battle of Lincoln. According to John of Hexham, he fled before the onset [5]: the other deserters at least waited till it was clear that the day was going against the king. There are two stories of his subsequent actions which differ somewhat in detail. According to the *Gesta*, he laid an ambush for the earl of Chester to avenge the capture of the king, but was himself captured and clapped into close and squalid confinement till he surrendered his castle and did homage to Ranulf.[6] John of Hexham has it that he withdrew to Galclint where he was pursued by the earl of Chester, who called him out to a parley, treacherously seized him, and forced him to do homage and hand over the castle.[7] It seems highly probable that Alan had hastened away before the battle of Lincoln to defend his important capture of Galclint. It is possible that he did so in the interests of the king (though this is not a material consideration here); and, in support of this view, it may be pointed out for what it is worth that he was amongst those who joined the king upon his release from captivity.[1]

---

[1] *Eng. Place-Names Soc., Northants*, p. 120.

[2] Joh. Hexh, p. 306.

[3] For the pedigree of Todeni and Albini Brito, lords of Belvoir, see Round, *Hist. MSS. Comm., D. of Rutland's MSS.*, iv. p. 106.

[4] Dugdale, *Baronage*, p. 111.

[5] Joh. Hexh, p. 306.

[6] *Gesta*, p. 72.

[7] Joh. Hexh, p. 308.

The earl of Chester's anxiety to possess himself of Galclint and its treasure is obvious. Was this due to greed, or did genuine claims to William de Albini's inheritance lie behind it? The most important of the Belvoir lands lay in Lincolnshire, Leicestershire and Northamptonshire, a region which it was Ranulf's ambition to dominate; and Belvoir castle was, strategically, of the greatest value to him. The earliest extant document in which there appears a specific grant to Ranulf of the castle and honour of Belvoir and all the lands of William de Albini is the well-known abstract of Stephen's charter of 1149,[2] but there is clear evidence of his possession of these at an earlier date. A charter of Ranulf to Pipewell Abbey, which falls between December 1148 and December 1153, draws attention to his claims to an hereditary right in the wood of Stoke Albany which William de Albini had given to the Abbey, and which Ranulf confirms to it.[3] Of four charters in the Belvoir Chartulary which bear upon Ranulf's possession of the honour, one can be dated with certainty prior to 1149. This is a notification by Ranulf, earl of Chester, addressed to Alexander, bishop of Lincoln, and Walter, archdeacon of Leicester, and the whole convent of St. Mary of Lincoln, that the church of Redmild is founded on the land and fee of Robert Basset, and is his. The earl grants that he may do with it what he reasonably will, and confirms it to Belvoir Priory.[4] The witnesses provide no limits of date,[5] but an inferior limit is provided by the fact that the charter is addressed to Alexander, bishop of Lincoln, who died at the beginning of 1148; and if the rather nebulous Walter, archdeacon of Leicester, could be identified with the Walter of Henry of Huntingdon's *Epistola de Contemptu Mundi*, the charter could not be later than 1145, and would probably be several years earlier.[1]

---

[1] He attests Stephen's second charter to Geoffrey de Mandeville at Canterbury at Christmas, 1141. Round, *G. de M.*, p. 143.

[2] P.R.O., Duchy of Lanc. Misc. Ptf. i. no. 36; printed in Farrer, *Lancs. Ch.*, p. 367. For the date, see Round, E.H.R., x. pp. 87–91.

[3] Chartulary of Pipewell, B.M. MS. Cott. Calig., A. xii. fo. 10 v°; Add. MS. 37022. The superior limit of date is given by the address to R., bishop of Lincoln. Robert was consecrated on 16 Dec., 1148.

[4] *Hist. MSS. Comm., D. of Rutland's MSS.*, iv. p. 147.

[5] These are Geoffrey Maleb' (who may be either Malebisse or Malebanc: probably the former, who was a Lincolnshire tenant of the earl), and Richard Bac' (perhaps Richard Bacun, the earl's nephew).

Now, John of Hexham, in recounting Ranulf's seizure of Alan of Brittany after the battle of Lincoln, says "castrum de Galclint et thesaurum in eo repertum sibi *reconsignare* coegit." Of course any argument founded upon John of Hexham's latinity would be a very thin one; but at least it may be noticed that "reconsignare" seems to suggest restoration rather than mere surrender. It is possible that Ranulf had acquired a right in William de Albini's lands before this episode; perhaps at the time of Stephen's visit to Lincoln.

The battle of Lincoln is rightly regarded as a personal affair between Ranulf and Stephen[2]; but it was a personal affair in a particular sense. The question at issue between them was a feudal question, the king and the earl each, in effect, alleging a breach on the part of the other of their feudal relationship, and recourse was had to the ultimate sanction of feudal law. It is only in this light that the familiar words of the Peterborough Chronicle in reference to their subsequent reconciliation at Stamford in the spring of 1142 have any real significance—they "swore oaths and plighted troth that neither of them would prove traitor to the other."

Ranulf's vital interests lay in the Midlands; in consolidating the fruits of victory; and in endeavouring to suppress such royalists as William Clerfai, who, from his stronghold of Tickhill, was carrying on a desultory warfare against him. The fact that the battle of Lincoln had been a great victory for the Angevin faction was, from Ranulf's point of view, incidental, and probably regrettable. The overwhelming nature of that victory bade fair to strengthen the Empress far more than he could have wished; and her behaviour as a victor must have caused him a great deal of uneasiness. Perhaps it was this that led him to join Stephen's queen when she summoned the royalist adherents to arms for an attack on Winchester. Not unnaturally his good faith was suspected and, practically hounded out of the queen's camp, he joined the Empress "tarde et inutiliter." [1]

---

[1] Henry of Huntingdon, *Ep. de Cont. Mund.* (R.S.), pp. 297–8, n. The Walter of the Epistle died between 1135 and 1145.

[2] That it was so regarded by contemporaries is emphasised in a charter of one of the earl's tenants dated "in anno quo commissum est prelium inter regem Stephanum et comitem Cestrie Ranulphum."—Stenton, *English Feudalism*, p. 242.

After the rout of the Empress and Stephen's release there was a cessation of hostilities from Christmas till Lent, 1142. The fortunes of the Empress were at low ebb, and Stephen, after his second coronation at Canterbury, determined to go to York to raise an army for a strong offensive. This involved passing through the sphere of the earl of Chester and his brother, who occupied a commanding position across his communications with his loyal northern province.[2] It was, in consequence, vitally necessary for him to conciliate Ranulf and his half-brother, just as he had already won over Geoffrey de Mandeville by extensive grants.[3] Indeed, the careers of Ranulf and Geoffrey during the years 1142–4 are, in many respects, so strikingly similar that the question whether there was any connection between them inevitably suggests itself.

Round was undoubtedly correct in assigning to the spring of 1142 Stephen's meeting with Ranulf and William de Roumare at Stamford, and his grant to the latter of the manor of Kirton-in-Lindsey and confirmation to him of Gainsborough castle.[4] No information about his dealings with Ranulf is available beyond the fact of their reconciliation, and it is idle to speculate upon the concessions which Ranulf may have wrung from him in addition to the probable confirmation of those he had already won. Stephen at least was not acting under pressure of adverse circumstances.

---

[1] Joh. Hexh, p. 310; W. Malmesb., ii. p. 580.

[2] Davis, *The Anarchy of Stephen's Reign*, E.H.R., xviii. pp. 630 ff., says that Stephen "commanded the support of a powerful party in Yorkshire," and although he does not examine it in detail, there is a good deal of evidence to support the contention.

[3] See Round, *G. de M.*, ch. vii.

[4] Round, *op. cit.*, p. 159, and E.H.R., x. p. 88.

Round held that from this till 1146

> the earl occupied a position of armed neutrality, not siding with either party, and with no wish to oppose the king so long as he was left in possession of Lincoln and the other portions of the crown demesne of which he had obtained possession." [1]

This is scarcely consonant with the known facts, for he was in active rebellion at the end of 1143. Under the year 1144 John of Hexham records that William, earl of York, harassed by the enmity of the earl of Chester and Gilbert de Gant,[2] fortified the church of St. Mary of Bridlington. He also records the violation of the church of Ripon by Alan of Brittany, though there is no clear indication that this was due to Ranulf's activities. Making allowance for the error which crept into John of Hexham's chronology after 1140,[3] these events should be placed in 1143. William of Malmesbury records the violation of Bridlington and Coventry by William, earl of York, and Robert Marmion,[4] respectively, under the year 1144 and, like John of Hexham, attributes the sacrilege to the enmity of the earl of Chester. None of the chronicles provides a clue to the cause of this new rebellion,

[1] E.H.R., x., p. 89.

[2] Gilbert de Gant was captured by Ranulf in the battle of Lincoln. He is said to have been forced to marry Ranulf's niece, Rohese, dau. of his sister Adeliz by Richard fitz Gilbert de Clare. It is alleged that he appears as earl of Lincoln about 1147, although there is no evidence that William de Roumare lost that earldom. He held the " Honor Constabularie " at one time under Stephen, and alienated nearly a third of it.—Round, *G. de M.*, p. 327.

[3] He placed the death of archbishop Thurstan in 1141 instead of 1140, and thereafter post-dated events by a year. In some instances he is even more seriously at fault, as, e.g., when he places Stephen's seizure of the earl of Chester in 1149 instead of 1146.

[4] A Robert Marmion attests a number of Ranulf's charters. Round suggests (*G. de M.*, p. 313) that the Marmions and Beauchamps took sides in the struggle because of their rivalry over Tamworth,

but it is difficult to see more than three alternatives. Either Stephen had broken their agreement or attacked the earl; or Ranulf took advantage of favourable circumstances to renounce his allegiance and indulge in open aggression; or else he had been won over by the Empress. One can do no more than examine these alternatives in the light of the general situation.

Stephen's move from York against Oxford in the spring of 1142 had been held up in its early stages when he fell ill at Northampton—so ill that his death was commonly reported—and he was obliged to dismiss his forces and remain there till Whitsuntide. This immobilisation of the royalists raised the hopes of the Angevin supporters and roused them to renewed activity. Round advanced the hypothesis, in view of the astonishing grants made by the Empress to Geoffrey de Mandeville and Aubrey de Vere in the latter half of 1142, that a conspiracy was on foot to raise a revolt in the eastern counties, which should take Stephen in the rear when the expected arrival of Geoffrey of Anjou and his son should make possible an advance upon London from the west.[1] This plan received a serious set-back, partly through the reluctance of the count of Anjou to come to England, but more particularly by Stephen's vigorous action, which resulted in the capture of Oxford in September, 1142. This left the Angevin party with little hope of maintaining itself in the Thames valley, and the revolt which had been planned had, of necessity, to be postponed till a more favourable time. The embers of this plot, whose existence must have been more than suspected by Stephen's supporters, were fanned into flame by the seizure of Geoffrey de Mandeville at St. Albans about the end of September, 1143; and the carefully planned revolt broke out prematurely, at a time when the Empress was not in a position to offer effective co-operation. The rebellion of Geoffrey de Mandeville and Hugh Bigod, with the unco-ordinated support of numerous Angevin adherents in the south-west marks the zenith of the anarchy.

---

[1] Round, *G. de M.*, ch. viii; particularly pp. 177 and 195–200.

Geoffrey's seizure of Ramsey Abbey marks as nearly as possible the dividing-line between 1143 and 1144.[1] We learn from the *Gesta* that Stephen, failing to come to grips with Geoffrey, left a force to keep him in check and " ad alia explenda regni negotia alio divertit ".[2] There is reason to suppose that this other business was the abortive attack on Lincoln castle, for, although it is not mentioned in the *Gesta* it is the first event chronicled by Henry of Huntingdon under the year 1144.[3] Obviously, then, Stephen regarded the earl of Chester as one of his most dangerous enemies; but it is equally obvious that, already faced by a serious, not to say ferocious rebellion, he would never have attacked the earl unless he had been in arms against him. We may dismiss the idea that Stephen's bad faith or his attack on Lincoln castle was the immediate cause of Ranulf's rebellion. The question remains whether Ranulf's rebellion at the end of 1143 was an independent one or whether he had been drawn into the Angevin plot. I believe that the latter was the case. There is no reason to doubt that the Angevins would have striven to secure his co-operation, for he held a strategical position which was vitally important for the success of their plan. Stephen had a considerable body of loyal supporters in Yorkshire, upon whose military resources he depended in no small degree; and his 1142 offensive against Oxford had been delivered from the north with a northern army. If the Angevins contemplated an offensive eastwards, supported by a rising in the eastern counties, it was essential that Stephen's northern forces should be immobilised; for if they were not immobilised, the strategical initiative would lie with them, and they would be free to strike south-westwards at the Angevin communications. No one was better situated for the task of immobilising the northern loyalists than the earl of Chester, and that is exactly what he accomplished in 1143–4. This, I venture to suggest, is the true inwardness of the description of Ranulf's rebellion which is given in the *Gesta* :

---

[1] Howlett, *Chronicles of Stephen, etc.* (R.S.), iii, p. 105 n.; Round, *op. cit.*, pp. 209–10.

[2] *Gesta*, p. 107.

[3] H. Hunt., p. 277.

> Comes namque Cestriae universam illam Borealem plagam continua persecutione affligere, regis barones, quotquot sibi erant affiniores, jugi insectatione gravare, et nunc quidem eorum municipia furtis clandestinis surripere, sibique inclinare, nunc igne, et gladio, eorum possessiones et terras, hostica depopulatione delere ; bellumque tantum, et afflictionem anhelans furibundus, cunctis, et intolerabilis occurerre.[1]

It is worthy of note that one of the barons who was particularly singled out for attention was William of Albemarle, earl of York, a leader of the loyalist party in Yorkshire ; and Ranulf carried the war into the very heart of his territory. Looked at in this light, Stephen's attempt to surprise Lincoln at the beginning of 1144 was, in all probability, intended to create a diversion and enable the northern barons to rally.

Ranulf would never have undertaken this rôle save for a handsome consideration ; but no trace has survived of any concessions from the Empress at this time. Between 1144 and 1146 the chronicles are silent as to his activities, and Stephen's attention during that period was occupied in dealing with Geoffrey, and after his death Stephen de Mandeville, Hugh Bigod, Turgis of Avranches and other rebels, and in campaigning in the marches between his own sphere and that of the Empress. It is tempting to suppose that Stephen bought Ranulf's neutrality by further concessions, or at the very least by a confirmation of what he had presumably obtained from the Empress. It is just within the bounds of possibility that Ranulf's possession of the Honour of Lancaster south of the Ribble dates from this time. There is no conclusive evidence of his possession of it before 1147, but the presumption is that he got it some years earlier when Stephen, whose fee it was, was very hard pressed.[1]

---

[1] *Gesta*, p. 107.

By the beginning of 1146 the balance of success seemed to be inclining so definitely in Stephen's favour that Ranulf thought it politic to make an impressive demonstration of his loyalty. The Author of the *Gesta* reminds us that " tertiam fere regni partem armis prevalentibus, occuparat," and nothing was to be gained in risking it by holding aloof from a winning cause. As an earnest of his zeal he captured Bedford for the king, and assisted at the siege of Wallingford in the early part of 1146.[2] In all probability this somewhat demonstrative manifestation of loyalty to Stephen cost him his Norman fiefs, for Normandy was now under the domination of Geoffrey of Anjou.[3] But, for the nonce, Ranulf was prepared to suffer even to this extent for the cause, and to play the rôle of a dutiful earl palatine. The reason is to be sought not merely in Stephen's growing strength, but in the situation in Wales, which was undoubtedly causing him genuine alarm. He came to Stephen's court at Northampton with complaints of Welsh inroads and a proposal that the king should undertake a Welsh campaign, to which he promised to contribute liberally. Stephen would fain have agreed, but the hatred and suspicion with which the royalist barons regarded the earl discovered in the proposal a transparent plot to betray the king. They remembered that a Welsh contingent had accompanied Ranulf to the relief of Lincoln in 1141; whether or not they were acquainted with the situation in Wales they appreciated the difficulties of campaigning in its mountain fastnesses; and they knew the danger of Angevin recovery in the absence of the king and his army from an England but half subdued.

---

[1] Farrer, *Lancs. Ch.*, pp. 277–8; Tait, *Medieval Manchester*, p. 169; Cronne, *The Honour of Lancaster in Stephen's Reign*, E.H.R., l. pp. 674–80.

[2] Ranulf attests a charter of Stephen in favour of the hospital of St. Peter, York, dated " apud obsidionem de Walingford."—*Cal. Chart. R.*, ii. p. 438. He takes precedence of the other two witnesses, Baldwin fitz Gilbert and Richard de Lucy.

[3] See Round, *Family Origins*, pp. 214–16.

A number of them, too, had grievous injuries to avenge, which they had received at Ranulf's hands in his last rebellion. It speaks volumes for Ranulf's essential simplicity that he ever made the proposal. As in the case of Geoffrey de Mandeville, the barons forced the king's hand and had Ranulf arrested. The Welsh, when they heard of his imprisonment, ravaged the province of Chester, but were routed by Robert of Montalt, seneschal of Chester, at Nantwich on 3 September.[1] Of Ranulf's supporters—and the author of the *Gesta* speaks of them in terms which suggest formidable numbers—some flew to arms, while others made a temporary submission and strove to secure their lord's release.[2]

Stephen, slow to profit by experience, released Ranulf as he had released Geoffrey de Mandeville three years earlier, and with an identical result, when he had exacted from him an oath of good behaviour, hostages for its fulfilment,[3] and the surrender of his castles, including at last Lincoln and Coventry. The king kept the Christmas festival in high state at Lincoln, and with profound satisfaction to himself, if not to his adherents, for he regarded its recovery as, strategically and for its moral effect, one of his greatest achievements. No sooner was Ranulf released than, with callous disregard for the safety of his hostages and contempt of the Church's anathema, he burst into a blind fury of rebellion, scarcely discriminating between friend and foe.[4] After Stephen's departure he hurled himself upon Lincoln, which was defended by its citizens with a determination and valour born of bitter experience. Baffled at Lincoln, he turned his arms against his city of Coventry, which was relieved by the king in person. The loss of that city and castle was a blow to him no less severe than that of Lincoln, and possibly even more galling to his self-esteem. The Midland area which he strove to dominate was, broadly speaking, an equilateral triangle with its apex at Coventry and the extremities of its base at Chester and Lincoln. For strategical and other reasons Coventry was invaluable to him. Ivo, his constable of Coventry, was obviously a man of some standing in the honour of Chester, for he was among the named witnesses (all of them important tenants and officers) to his grant of the constableship of Chester to Eustace fitz John.[1] Ranulf was a benefactor of the abbey,[2] and to the burgesses of the city he granted the liberties and free customs which they had in the time of his father, and the laws and customs which the citizens of Lincoln then had : their free portmannemot was guaranteed to them, and the earl's constables were forbidden to cite them to the castle on any plea.[3]

---

[1] *Annales Cestrenses*, sub ann. 1146.

[2] *Gesta*, p. 125.

[3] These included Ranulf's nephew, Gilbert de Clare.

[4] *Gesta*, p. 126.

Stephen was still making head against Ranulf when the chroniclers again leave us in the lurch, and there is nothing to show how long the rebellion continued. It is to be assumed that Ranulf remained hostile to the king till 1149. It is tempting to see in Henry Plantagenet's abortive expedition to England in 1147 an intimate connection with Ranulf's continued rebellion. Round denied that this visit ever occurred,[4] but Mr. A. L. Poole has argued very convincingly for the accuracy of the *Gesta's* record of it.[5]

By the end of 1147 the Angevin cause was at lowest ebb, and the tale of misfortune was completed by the death of Robert, earl of Gloucester, on 31 October. For the time being there was no one capable of filling his position as effective leader of the party in England, and recourse was had to the by no means disinterested loyalty of the Empress's kinsman, the king of Scots. Thus the year 1149 witnessed the formation of a promising but unstable coalition. Henry undertook a new expedition to England, probably, as Round suggested, on the understanding that David should sink his differences with the earl of Chester and secure his active co-operation against Stephen.[1] He met David at Carlisle, was knighted by him on 22 May, confirmed Northumberland to him with the addition of Newcastle, and promised that "inter Twedam et Tynam" should be his if he himself became king. They were joined by the earl of Chester who, in consideration of receiving the whole Honour of Lancaster and of a marriage alliance between a daughter of Henry of Northumberland and one of his sons, agreed to abandon his claim to Carlisle.[2] A joint offensive against Stephen was arranged and Lancaster was fixed as the rendezvous of their forces. Stephen, meanwhile, had taken up his position at York with a strong force—a significant move, since York has been considered "the true centre for all offensive strategy in north-eastern England . . . a position from which to strike." [3] Ranulf failed to keep his agreement with Henry and the king of Scots, and the coalition collapsed. This defection has been explained by Round as the consequence of that astonishing series of grants made by Stephen to Ranulf in a charter which is only known through an abstract preserved in the Duchy of Lancaster Records.[4] The terms of this charter are sufficiently well known, and its significance has been duly emphasised by scholars.[5] It marks the recognition of Ranulf as the dominant feudal potentate in the northern Midlands, and one of the decisive political forces in the final stages of the struggle between Stephen and Henry.

---

[1] B.M. MS. Harl. 2037, fo. 194. This charter is prior to 1149—see Farrer, *Lancs. Ch.*, pp. 319–20.

[2] *Cal. Chart. R.*, v. 102.

[3] *Cal. Chart. R.*, ii. 88 ; Farrer, *Hons. and Kts'. Fees*, ii. 280. See also note 1, p. 117.

[4] Round, *G. de M.*, App. Y.

[5] E.H.R., xlvii. 447.

There is no doubt that Ranulf's two rebellions of 1144 and 1146 spread devastation throughout Yorkshire, Lincolnshire and the Midlands. Of lawless and sacrilegious acts on the part of Ranulf and his allies there is evidence in plenty.[1] Ranulf himself makes restitution for wrongs done, amongst others, to the Church of Lincoln [2] and to Chester Abbey.[3] It is perhaps worth while to say that all such injuries must not be assumed to have been caused by violence. They might be the result of sharp practice, or even of somewhat unscrupulous piety as in the case of Robert, earl of Leicester, who appears to have appropriated the bishop of Lincoln's fee at Leicester for his new foundation of St. Mary de Pré, giving bishop Alexander an exchange which pleased him ill, and being subsequently obliged to augment it by making over to him ten burgesses with their burgages.[4]

---

[1] E.H.R., x. 87 ff.

[2] Joh. Hexh. (R.S.), p. 323. See also H. A. Cronne, E.H.R., l. pp. 670 ff.

[3] Collingwood and Myres, *Roman Britain and the English Settlements*, pp. 109–10.

[4] Publ. Rec. Off., Duchy of Lancaster, Misc. ptf. i, no. 36. Farrer, *Lancs. Ch.*, pp. 367–8. Foster, *Reg. Antiq. of Linc. Cathedral*, pp. 287–8.

[5] Round, E.H.R., x. pp. 87 ff. ; Stenton, *Eng. Feud.*, pp. 240 ff.

A rough and ready means of assessing the extent of the devastation caused by the anarchy is provided by comparing in the Pipe Roll of 2 Hen. II the proportion which the amount deducted for waste from the Danegeld of each shire bears to the total amount of Danegeld which it owes.[5] The proportion of waste thus shown in Lincolnshire is over $\frac{1}{4}$; in Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire over $\frac{1}{2}$; in Leicestershire over $\frac{1}{2}$; in Northamptonshire about $\frac{1}{3}$; in Staffordshire nearly $\frac{1}{5}$. These may be instructively compared with the proportion of waste shown by other representative shires, such as, on the one hand, Kent $\frac{1}{264}$, and Sussex about $\frac{1}{23}$ (both of which escaped the worst of the anarchy); and on the other hand, Oxfordshire about $\frac{2}{5}$ and Gloucestershire nearly $\frac{1}{3}$ (which were the scene of constant campaigning). Ranulf's sphere of activity, on this showing, suffered on the whole more severely than any other.

Doubtless the prosecution of the feud between Ranulf and the earl of Leicester, which is borne witness to by the well-known treaty between them,[1] contributed its quota to the devastation. This treaty falls between December, 1148, and Ranulf's death in December, 1153.[2] There are, in addition, a number of charters bearing upon the relations of the two earls which, from internal evidence, are of earlier date than the treaty. The first is a grant by Ranulf to the earl of Leicester, attested " in agris deinter Legrecastrum et Monte Sorell " between 1140 and May, 1147,[3] of Charley and all woods adjoining the grantee's forest of Leicester, except Barrow Park, together with all Ranulf's estates in the city of Leicester. " Et de hac tenura fidem mihi fecit sicut domino de quo tenet." [4] These very lands had been handed over by Ranulf's father to Henry I, who had granted them to the present grantee's father.[5] It seems that Ranulf must have reclaimed them from Stephen with consequent complications in his relations with the earl of Leicester. The second charter is a grant by Ranulf to the earl of Leicester, about 1148,[6] " in feodo et hereditate pro homagio suo," of the town and castle of Mountsorrell, a stronghold which lay some 5 miles north of Leicester. He also confirms to the earl of Leicester " omnes tenuras de quibus erat meus affidatus et sicut carta mea ei testatur," which must refer to Charley, close to Mountsorrel.[7] Ranulf also made a number of grants in the same district to the earl of Leicester's foundation of St. Mary de Pré.[1]

---

[1] See, e.g., Stenton, *Eng. Feud.*, p. 244; and *Danelaw Charters*, p. 375.

[2] Foster, *Reg. Antiq. of Linc. Cathedral*, i, pp. 94, 96–7; ii, p. 7.

[3] Tait, *Chartulary of Chester Abbey*, i, p. 23.

[4] MSS. of J. H. Round at the Institute of Historical Research, no. 823; Foster, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 16.

[5] See H. W. C. Davis, *The Anarchy of Stephen's Reign*, E.H.R., xviii. pp. 639 ff.

---

[1] In the Brit. Mus. under ref. Cotton, Nero, C. iii. fo. 178 (the MS. is now on exhibition) ; *New Palæog. Soc.*, Facs. ii. pl. 40 ; Stenton, *Eng. Feud.*, pp. 249–55, 285.

[2] The superior limit is determined by the pledge which each earl gave to Robert, bishop of Lincoln, who was consecrated on 16 Dec., 1148.

[3] The MS. reads " et agris . . .," which may be a mistake either for " et aliis " or " in agris." The latter reading seems the more probable. The limits of date are provided by the attestation of William, earl of Lincoln ; and Roger, bishop of Chester, who went on crusade in May, 1147, and died at Antioch on 16 April, 1148.

[4] Hist. MSS. Comm., Hastings MSS., i. pp. 66–7.

[5] Ormerod, *History of Cheshire* (ed. Helsby), i. pp. 24–5.

[6] The date is that given by Stenton, *Eng. Feud.*, p. 285, q.v. for the text of the charter.

[7] These charters raise questions of the feudal relationship between the earls of Chester and Leicester which cannot be discussed here.

Turning to the treaty between the earls, whose importance as a feudal document has been discussed by professor Stenton [2]: its language indicates a fierce struggle between the two magnates in Leicestershire; the earl of Chester supported by Robert, earl of Derby, and the earl of Leicester by his son-in-law Simon, earl of Northampton. The first point in the agreement is, in effect, the confirmation of the earl of Leicester's tenure of Mountsorrel, with a proviso which does not appear in the original grant, that he should receive the earl of Chester in the borough and baileys, as in his fee, to make war upon whomsoever he wishes, and that he may not attack the earl of Chester therefrom. Mountsorrel dominated an extensive group of the earl of Chester's tenements which lay between Leicester and the northern border of the county. Provision is made for the destruction of the castle of Ravenstone, near the borders of Leicestershire and Derbyshire, which, judging from the terms of the treaty, seems to have been an adulterine castle which was a source of annoyance to both parties. A disturbing feature of the anarchy from the point of view of the great barons was that the sub-tenants were getting out of hand, a fact which is borne witness to by the careful provisions of this treaty both concerning the destruction of castle Ravenstone and for dealing with William de Alneto, the earl of Leicester's man, if he should attempt to cause further trouble. The castle of Whitwick, situated a little to the east of Ashby, in the same region as Ravenstone, remained fortified in the earl of Leicester's possession, doubtless as an outlying protection to the westward for the city of Leicester. Finally, neither earl is to build any new castle between Hinckley, Hartshill and Coventry, nor between Coventry and Donington, nor between Donington and Leicester, nor at Gotham or Kinoulton nor nearer to

---

[1] *Mon. Angl.*, VI, i. pp. 466–7.

[2] Stenton, *Eng. Feud.*, pp. 248–55.

Leicester, nor between Kinoulton and Belvoir and Oakham, nor between Oakham and Rockingham nor nearer. This circuit of Leicester is drawn very much in favour of earl Robert, and the agreement in effect excludes Leicestershire from Ranulf's great Midland Principality, except in so far as he could assert his technical overlordship in respect of Charley and Mountsorrel.

Though the power of the earl of Leicester imposed an effectual limit to Ranulf's ambitions in one direction, his mercenary spirit and his political and military importance enabled him to extend it in others. Just as Stephen had bought him in 1149, so in 1153 Henry purchased his support by concessions no less imposing. It is unnecessary to examine this Devizes charter in detail, since both its territorial concessions and its significance as a feudal document and as a landmark in the political history of Stephen's reign have already been very fully discussed.[1] Diplomatically the charter is interesting, for its form no less than its content proclaims it a document of the first importance. Amongst other notable features it is ornamented by a crudely drawn border in the form of a red line between two gilt lines—surely a very unusual practice in England at this date.[2]

Ranulf did not long enjoy the fruits of his calculated inconstancy. The treaty of Wallingford, concluded between Stephen and Henry on 6 November, 1153, destroyed Ranulf's market value and marked the beginning of the end of baronial licence. At the zenith of his power Ranulf died in December, 1153—a year which witnessed the deaths of many outstanding men in Britain and on the Continent: David king of Scots, Eustace, son of king Stephen, Henry Murdac, Archbishop of York, St. Bernard of Clairvaux, pope Eugenius III. A new age was beginning; an age in which a rehabilitated monarchy could turn to account the loyal services of a Richard de Lucy and an earl of Leicester, but in which the type of feudal potentate represented by Ranulf of Chester could have no part.

---

[1] See R. W. Eyton, William Salt Archæol. Soc., *Staffs. Hist. Collections*, II, pp. 220 ff.; Round, E.H.R., x. pp. 87 ff.; Stenton, *Eng. Feud.*, pp. 241–2; Farrer, *Lancs. Ch.*, pp. 370 ff.

[2] *Cotton Charter*, xvii. 2; *New Pa. Soc.*, ii. pl. 40; Printed by Farrer, *loc. cit.*

Ranulf's death was attributed to poison at the hands of William Peverel, whose fief had been included in Henry's grant of 1153. Around his death-bed in Gresley Castle there gathered, besides the officers of his household, a goodly assembly of prelates—the bishop of Chester, the abbots of Grimsby, Radmore and Raucester, the prior of Calke and the earl's own chaplains. If they offered him spiritual comfort in his last hours they exacted a price for their ministrations. The abbey of St. Werburgh, which had already received many grants at his hands, obtained Eastham and Bromborough in compensation for injuries done by him.[1] He made a further grant of tithes to Minting, Trentham and Chester,[2] and extensive grants in Staffordshire to the foundation of Trentham.[3] Dugdale alleges that he died excommunicate, but the presence of the prelates at his death-bed seems to disprove it, and he was buried beside his father in Chester Abbey.

---

[1] Tait, *Chartulary of Chester Abbey*, I, p. 231.

[2] *Reg. of Spalding*, B.M. MS. Add. 35296, fo. 410 v°.

[3] *Staffs. Historical Collections*, XI.

RICHARD DE BURY (1287–1345)

BY N. DENHOLM-YOUNG, M.A., F.R.HIST.S.

Read 12 *November*, 1936

§ 1. EARLY LIFE

THIS résumé of some of the problems connected with the life of Richard de Bury is complementary to three noteworthy articles by Father Ghellinck in the *Révue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* for 1922–3, in which he used the *Philobiblon* and an abundance of other literary and record sources to place the Bishop in his setting as the greatest bibliophile of medieval Europe. That admirable contribution to the history of literature and manuscripts still leaves room, however, for some remarks on the history of Bury's life, as civil servant, diplomat, and patron of letters; and this will involve a discussion of his *Liber Epistolaris*.[1]

For Richard de Bury's life all later writers have drawn largely upon the valuable account prefixed by E. C. Thomas to his edition of the *Philobiblon* [2] in 1888. A brief biography is, however, still desirable, and the task has imposed itself upon me as a necessary prelude to an edition of his *Liber Epistolaris*.

A word must be said of the material for this career. The narrative sources are in fact only two: the Durham Chronicle of William de Chambre, and certain portions of the *Philobiblon*.

It is therefore important to be clear about the work of

---

[1] I am indebted to Mr. R. L. Atkinson and Mrs. Margaret Sharp for help at a number of points in the preparation of this paper.

[2] Pp. xi–xlv.

William de Chambre. At one time the whole of the third section of the printed Durham Chronicle (as printed by Wharton in *Anglia Sacra*, and by James Raine for the Surtees Society as one of the *Scriptores Tres*) was attributed to Chambre. No one seems to have troubled themselves with this problem, which would have put Chambre in Elizabeth's reign, until Raine discovered[1] a William de Chambre, marshal of Durham Priory, who flourished in 1366, and decided that this must be the author. However, an examination of the manuscripts has shown that this part of the Chronicle is composite.[2] The first edition was written after 1381 and contained a brief account of Bury's life derived from a *tabula pensilis*—hanging no doubt in the Cathedral. A little later in another version was inserted a second paragraph about Bury headed "*Que iam sequuntur narravit Willelmus de Chambre*."

This is followed by a third brief section minutely describing the vestments and treasures bequeathed by Bury to the Priory.

The life is thus in two main portions, (1) the paragraph *Ricardus de Bury fuit sufficienter litteratus . . . tumulatus* from the "table" (the last paragraph in *Scriptores Tres* and (2) the *Ricardus de Bury natus fuit in quadam villula prope Edmundisbury . . . in maximo honore*, which I regard as the reminiscences of William de Chambre delivered orally in the 1380's to the monk in charge of the chronicle. Apart from this, Chambre's chronicle does not exist. Thus, though the *tabula* may have been written up quite shortly after the Bishop's death, the other paragraph is the work of the next generation. But the value of the information in it need not be discounted by anything appearing in the later Durham chronicles.

Bury tells us, in the colophon to the *Philobiblon*, that the book was finished on 24 January, 1344–5, his 58th year, being *precise completo*, by which it is generally understood that the work was finished on his birthday. He was therefore born in 1287—a deduction confirmed by Chambre's testimony that he was consecrated Bishop of Durham in his 46th year.[1] He is not heard of officially until 1316, when he was 29, but we learn from Chambre that he was the son of a Leicestershire knight, Sir Richard de Aungerville, of Willoughby, that he was born in a little village near St. Edmundsbury and educated by his uncle, John de Willoughby, a rector, at a grammar school, before going to Oxford.[2] It was no doubt at this time that he adopted the *cognomen* de Bury, though until about 1330 he is often styled *Ricardus de sancto Edmundo.* His residence at Oxford must, on grounds of age, be dated *c.* 1302–12, and probably covered the whole of that period, as he took not only an M.A. but also his B.D.[3] Our knowledge of the Oxford curricula is derived from a later age, but presumably in the time of Scotus and Ockham these degrees could hardly be taken in less than ten years. At any rate, in 1312 Bury seems to have become a King's Clerk.

---

[1] Too late, alas, to alter his page-headings!

[2] For what follows see "The Birth of a Chronicle" in the *Bodleian Quarterly Record*, Vol. VII, no. 80, pp. 325–8.

He himself tells us that he gave up his studies in order to do this.[4] There is a letter in his *Liber Epistolaris* which can be dated January–April 1312, asking that *R. de B. clericus domini nostri regis et nostri* may be allowed to hold benefices in plurality, as his income is only twenty marks a year. The letter is from Walter Langton, Bishop of Lichfield and Treasurer to Archbishop Winchilsea, so it seems likely, if R. de B., rector of S., may be interpreted as Richard de

---

[1] As Chambre's reminiscences occupy only three pages in the *Scriptores tres* and I shall have occasion to refer to them frequently, no further reference will be given.

[2] Nicholl's *Leicestershire*, IV, 392, gives a not very helpful account of the family. A Sir John de Aungerville occurs as knight of the Shire for Leicestershire in 1307 and 1312: see further *Knights of Edward I* (Harleian Soc.).

[3] The only allusion to this is in Bod. Lib. MS. Ashmole 794, fol. 45 (cf. *E.H.R.* (1933), p. 438, note 5), in a letter of *c.* 1332.

[4] *Philobiblon*, cap. viii. The myth that he was ever a monk at Durham must come, I think, from the confusion made in the Cardigan MS. of Murimuth between Bury and Robert de Graystanes.

Bury, rector of Sawbridgeworth, that Bury started his official career as clerk to Langton while the latter was Treasurer.[1] This association with Langton could explain a number of points in Bury's history. It enables us to understand why he took office at Chester, for he would already be a familiar figure in a city with which the Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield was closely associated.[2] It throws light on a letter written about 1330 from the Chapter of Lichfield thanking Bury for many past favours. It explains the presence in the *Liber Epistolaris* of a group of letters relating to Langton.

Bury's official career is now easier to follow. In October 1316 and April 1317 he is found as a clerk in the exchequer of Chester, and had thus entered the service of the master to whom he was ever faithful—the future Edward III, Earl of Chester since 1312.[3] In 1319 Bury became Clerk to the Justices of Chester, and is found acting as Chamberlain by 26 May, 1320,[4] an office which he continued to hold until 1323, or perhaps 1324.[5] His next public position is as Constable of Bordeaux in 1326, for his master was now Duke of Aquitaine. What was he doing in the interval? Professor Tout thought it "likely that Bury continued in Edward's service,"[6] and a recently-discovered fragmentary account of Edward's household for 1325, just before he crossed to France, has confirmed this view. This showed quite clearly that Mr. Richard de Bury was in August–September 1325 an official in Edward of Windsor's household, and some details suggest that he was marshal thereof.[7]

---

[1] *Lib. ep.*, fol. 23^{v}. Langton was in prison 1308–12, when he again became Treasurer, and Winchilsea died in 1313.

[2] Ormerod, *Cheshire*, I, p. lv.

[3] Chester Plea Roll (Chester 29), 30, *m.* 17.

[4] Brown, *Chester Chamberlain's Accounts*, p. 89.

[5] He accounted as Chamberlain for the year Michaelmas 1322 (*K.R.M.R.*, no. 106, *m.* 130*d*) and is called late chamberlain on 18 July, 1324 (Chester Recognisance Roll, 13, *m.* 2). The Recognisance Roll for 1323–4 is lost.

[6] *Chapters*, III, 26.

[7] *E.H.R.* (1933), pp. 431–43. "Edward of Windsor and Bermondsey Priory."

Another gleam of light is shed by a petition from Robert de Shireburn in 1334 for arrears of wages (40*s.* a year) and robes as a Councillor to Edward from June 1325 onwards which was granted because the King learned by the testimony of Richard, Bishop of Durham, that the facts were as stated.[1] So there is reason also to believe that Bury too was one of Edward's Councillors in June 1325, as he naturally would have been in 1320 when he was Chamberlain.

At about this point in Bury's history Chambre tells us that he acted as Edward of Windsor's [2] tutor. To this Professor Tout objected on two grounds: "His normal residence in Cheshire and the complete absence of positive evidence, refute the tradition that he was Edward's tutor," and secondly, one John Paynel, parson of Rostherne, is spoken of on the Close Roll for 1329 as being occupied at some earlier date *intendendo doctrine litterature*, with reference to the King's youth.[3] Bury is consequently dismissed as "a professional administrator and not more highly educated than the mass of household clerks": he is even denied the title of *magister*. But this attitude to Bury's literary pretensions, which Tout displayed elsewhere,[4] seems to me to be not entirely justified.

Now Edward of Windsor, born in 1312, would have had a tutor from about 1320 to 1326.[5] In 1326 John Paynel succeeded Bury as Chamberlain of Chester. May he not already have succeeded him at an earlier date in another capacity? No doubt Paynel was Edward's tutor at some date, but I cannot easily reject the clear statement of William de Chambre, whose account is accurate in so many of the particulars in which it can be checked. I find in it none of those " strange stories " to which Tout alluded, and I think that for some time between 1323 and 1326 Bury was in charge of Edward's education. Whether he doubled this with supervision of Edward's marshalsea is hard to say, but for a man of Bury's capacity who combined great political talent with the requisite literary qualifications, such a post must have been almost a sinecure. It may be imagined that he employed some of his leisure in making a fair copy of his epistolary collections. These may be dealt with before Bury's later career is considered.

---

[1] *C.Cl.R.* (1333–7), p. 267.

[2] *Assumptus ad instruendum Edwardum de Wyndesor.* Chambre definitely says *postmodum ordinatus est principalis receptor patris ejusdum in Wasconia.*

[3] *Chapters*, III, 25, and note 2.

[4] *Speculum*, VI (1931), p. 374: "Learning and Literature in the English Civil Service in the fourteenth century."

[5] Thomas, pp. xii–xiii, implies that Bury was thus occupied before 1320.

§ 2. BURY'S *LIBER EPISTOLARIS* AND ITS BEARING UPON HIS CAREER.

The *Liber Epistolaris* is a collection of about 1,500 documents, most of them real letters, usually with the dates omitted. The volume in which these are contained went to Bury St. Edmunds when the Bishop's library was dispersed. This, and the fact that it belonged to Bury, we know from fourteenth-century inscriptions on the first leaf. At a later date the manuscript passed into the library of Lord Harlech, through whose kindness I was allowed to transcribe it. About half the book consists of correspondence under the great seal with Rome or with Gascony, much of it derived from letters which are also on the Roman and Gascon rolls, but there are many Papal bulls. In date the letters range from the twelfth century to 1324, but the book is for the most part without arrangement. It is a formulary, not an official " letter-book," in which the documents would be arranged chronologically,[1] and there is little or nothing in it composed by Bury himself. The compilation of such a work is difficult to envisage, but the abundance of foreign correspondence and comparative lack of letters relating exclusively to England is, I think, easily explained. Bury took so much from the sources mentioned because more care was taken with their composition than with ordinary letters Close or Patent. He was not collecting mere *formulæ* but, as he might have said himself—*belles lettres.* I have pointed out elsewhere that the *Cursus Curie Romane*—rhythmical prose according to the rules of the Papal Chancery—was well known in England, and in the fourteenth century regularly employed by the English Chancery for its foreign correspondence.[1] Its full and frequent use begins with the Roman Roll, and it reaches its best period about the time of the ascendancy of Richard de Bury, about 1333–45. Many of our important diplomatic documents of this period would not have disgraced the Papal Chancery. As the earliest formulary compiled by a known royal official, and no doubt one of the largest in existence at that date, the volume has a certain interest.[2] How did Bury find time to put together so vast a collection of letters? The transcripts are careless, but they are beautifully written, in one hand throughout. The clarity, comparative lack of abbreviations, and regularity of the script, betray the professional scribe. It is not like an author's manuscript, but then de Bury was a professional scribe, and the famous *Pater Sancte* letter to the Pope is a good example of his workmanship. It may be that he wrote the book with his own hand, and that in calligraphy, as in literary style, he sometimes thought more about how he wrote than what he was writing.

---

[1] Cf. " English Monastic Letter-Books," by W. A. Pantin, in *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait*, p. 201.

It used to be thought that the *Liber Epistolaris* was compiled when Bury was Chancellor, in 1334. The originals, thought Hardy, were brought to Bury's house and there copied by his clerks, in order that he might have precedents for drawing up similar letters.[3] This, however, is to mistake the occasion and purpose of the work. The Chancery in Bury's day was badly in arrears with its work, and one may suppose that Bury had better things to do at that time than to make a collection of fine letters. That no one of the letters can be dated after 1324, while a great many are to be dated about 1318–22 is some kind of argument in support of the view that the book was written not many years later. Such books were valuable to aspiring men, and the scope of this one may be taken as the measure of the compiler's ambitions.

---

[1] The Cursus in England, in *Oxford Essays in Mediæval History presented to H. E. Salter* (1934), pp. 84–91. An additional piece of evidence of some value is that Henry of Avranches (for whom see *The Shorter Latin Poems . . .*, ed. J. C. Russell and J. P. Heironimus, Cambridge, Mass., 1935), " The King's Versifier " (*Close Rolls*, 1242–7, p. 270), says, in the mid-thirteenth century that he tried to teach the English *dictamen*.

[2] The volume is incomplete and my search for the missing portions has so far been fruitless.

[3] *Reg. Pal. Dun.* (Rolls Series), IV, p. xxvi.

I believe, then, that this formulary was written in or shortly after 1324. It might be that the abundance of Gascon and Durham documents in it indicates the direction of de Bury's ambitions, but it is more probably fortuitous. The Gascon material would be very easily obtained by someone in his position, particularly as he did not obtain all his deeds from originals or even from enrolments. Some he took from John de Paynel's *quaternus*, so perhaps Paynel, who succeeded him as Edward III's tutor, if I am right, had preceded him in the compilation of a letter-book.[1] One section, at least, was derived from a contemporary Chancery Clerk, Thomas de Brayton.[2] In any case, not only the Gascon material but some of the letters relating to Durham came through the foreign correspondence of the Chancery.

Another source from which Bury drew heavily was an Italian one. This includes, besides some well-known material from the collections of Pierre de la Vigne and Thomas of Capua, some unidentified letters and a section of great interest known as the *Arenge* of Mr. Peter de Loro. Hardy ascribed this to Pierre de la Vigne, though the collections are totally different from those of Frederick II's Chancellor and are explicitly stated to have been composed in 1255, while Pierre de la Vigne died in 1249.[1]

---

[1] On fol. 203^v, "*de Johanne de Paynel de quaterno.*"

[2] On fol. 218. Opposite a letter to Clement V from Edward I, who is excusing himself for not going on crusade: "exemplar Thome de Brayton." This occurs naturally enough at the beginning of a Chancery section. If *exemplar* is used technically this would probably mean that Brayton had the official draft. Brayton was a King's clerk and canon of Glasgow in 1319 (*C.P.R.*, 1317–21, p. 380), and before 1327 had acquired six rectories (*C.P.R.*, 1321–4 and 1324–7). He was ambassador to France in 1329 (Déprez et Mirot, *Les Ambassades*, p. 44, no. IX; cf. *ibid.*, 191, no. 4), an admiral of the Fleet in 1338 (*ibid.*, 203), and clerk of the Parliament 1340–6 (*E.H.R.*, July, 1932, pp. 378, 381). See also B. Wilkinson, *The Chancery under Edward III*, pp. 154–5.

They are similar in character to those of Guido Faba written in 1268.[2] The contents show plainly that the writer has a special interest in the city-states of north and central Italy, Venice, Bologna, Cremona, and Mantua. Cremona, however, was not his own town, for he speaks of "*perfidi Cremonenses*" and we are told that "our city was for a long time at war against the emperor and the great cities of Italy," and that it was always on the side of the Church. A podestà is mentioned who comes into office on the first of May. Possibly Milan is meant. Of the compiler nothing has yet come to light, but there is nothing to suggest that the name Peter de Loro is other than the name of the real author.[3]

The contents of the *Arenge* are fully indicated in a table of contents. Many of them are set speeches to be made in the assemblies of some Italian city.[4] They are of interest because this type of literature is in the thirteenth century of much greater rarity than the ordinary letter-form,[5] and they show the identity that existed between the Latin style that was thought suitable for either. It must be remembered in this connexion that all reading was in the Middle Ages reading aloud. Further, there are *Arenge* for use when making a speech to the Pope, or to a cardinal, in precisely the same style as the *Arenge* with which formal letters began. Bury was well prepared for his later visits to Avignon.

---

[1] "For reasons which satisfy myself but which would be difficult to explain in *a few words*, I am of opinion that this name [Petrus de Loro] should be Petrus de Vineis, chancellor to the Emperor Frederick II, to whom a work of a similar nature, though of a different title, is attributed" (*op. cit.*, IV, p. xc, note 3).

[2] For Faba's work see the leaf given in facsimile in *Exempla Scripturarum*, fasc., ii.

[3] There are two places called Loro in Italy. One is Loro Ciuffena, 16 miles north-west of Arezzo; the other is Loro Piceno in Macerata province south of Ancona.

[4] "Preponente loqui," "Assurgo" (fol. 197^{v}), "In tanto cetu . . . surgens cognosco me" (fol. 108). The difference between the table of contents and the *arenge* themselves perhaps point to a second recension in which certain items were changed to suit another taste.

[5] For another instance see A. Wilmart, "L' 'Ars arengandi' de Jacques de Dinant," in *Analecta Reginensia*, Vatican City, 1933, pp. 113–51.

§ 3. BURY'S LATER CAREER, 1326–45

We left the rising civil servant in September 1325. We know from the fragmentary household account of August–September of that year that he crossed to France, shortly after Queen Isabella had fled thither with her son Edward of Windsor, now Duke of Aquitaine. From 19 February to 16 April, 1326, Bury was Constable of Bordeaux.[1] Chambre relates that in this capacity he secretly collected for the fugitives a large sum of money, which he brought to them at Paris. For this he was pursued to Paris by the King's representative in Gascony with twenty-four lances, and there he lay hidden for a week in the Campanile of the Franciscans.[2] Of this there is no other evidence. During the critical months that followed we cannot know what part he played. When Edward III came to the throne on 25 January, 1327, Bury quickly became Cofferer, and a little later Keeper and Treasurer (21 August–27 September) of the Wardrobe.[3] Immediately after this he became Keeper of the Privy Seal, an office which he held for the next three and a half years (September 1329–April 1333).[4] By this time the Privy Seal had ceased to be the private and confidential seal of the King. For this purpose its place had been taken by the secret seal, which dates from about 1312.[1] The office had become one of considerable political influence, and with Bury as Keeper, a man already in closest touch with the royal family, the opportunities for influencing policy were naturally great. Professor Tout, in his admirable later volumes, showed how Bury, acting "behind the scenes" inspired the King to rebel against the usurped authority of Isabella and Mortimer and how he increased the importance of the Privy Seal.[2] It is Bury who inaugurates a secret correspondence with the Papacy, in a letter now famous, discovered by the late Mr. Crump in the Vatican Archives, and containing the first royal autograph in our history.[3] This *Pater Sancte* letter, in the calligraphic, highly-stylised, and beautifully clear hand of Bury, is of uncertain date, but it is symptomatic of what was taking place between 1328 and 1330. The Keeper's favour with the King is seen in the shower of benefices which fell upon him between Edward III's accession in 1327 and his provision to the Bishopric of Durham in 1333.[1]

---

[1] *C.P.R.* (1330–4), p. 383, being a pardon of accounts as Constable, dated 30 Dec., 1332, and *ibid.* (1327–30), p. 505, for the same and for Chester, dated 29 March, 1330. Dr. Hubert Hall suggests to me that Bury may have waylaid some of the revenues in process of auditing between the Controller and the Constable (See Selden Soc., *Law Merchant*, Vol. II, pp. xxxv–vi, 93–6, 150–1).

[2] Chambre is, however, wrong in saying that Richard was Constable under Edward II. It was, nominally at any rate, usual for the Duke to appoint his Constables.

[3] *Chapters*, III, 26.

[4] *Ibid.*, V, 5–7. The dates are conjectural. See P.R.O., Var. Accts., 383/11.

---

[1] B. Wilkinson, *The Chancery under Edward III*, p. 15.

[2] Some years ago Miss Clarke brought to my notice some Ancient Petitions with endorsements relating to Richard de Bury. Since that time Mr. R. L. Atkinson has discovered others, so that we now have a group of twenty-three. Their numbers are: 1941, 2004, 2234, 2375, 2444, 2481, 2779, 2885, 2990, 3129, 3529, 4013, 4015, 4579, 5658, 6534, 7065, 7558, 7566, 7606, 7667, 7750, 13388. These are all endorsed "Coram Rege," which implies, according to Maitland, that they went before the king or a full meeting of the Council, and with a note that this petition is to be delivered to Sir Richard de Bury, who will show it to the King and learn his will. As more than half of them refer to Edward II as already dead, and as Bury is not yet called bishop of Durham, the date should be 1327–1333. They may perhaps have been presented in the York parliament of Dec.–Jan. 1332–3. The bulk of this group refers to long service by the petitioner with the king and his father (and sometimes Edward I) in Scotland and elsewhere, and this is a matter with which Bury as Privy Seal might be expected to deal. This date is made probable by A.P. 2779, which, as Mr. Atkinson tells me, is from Adam Lanark (who is unknown), and mentions the recent appointment of Henry Miles as porter of York Castle. "This was made 16 Dec., 1332, and revoked 26 Jan., 1333 (*C.P.R.*, pp. 378, 382). He was re-appointed 22 Oct., 1334 (*ibid.*, 1334–8, p. 36), but that date seems to be excluded by the fact that in 1334 de Bury would presumably have been called bishop of Durham."

[3] Crump dates this Sept., 1329, *E.H.R.*, XXVI, 331–2. Wilkinson, *The Chancery under Edw. III*, p. 99, does not give a date, but seems to suggest 1328.

Thus the whole of Bury's political career in public office immediately under the Crown falls between the years 1327 and 1335, when he was between 40 and 48 years of age. His ambassadorial career lasts longer—from 1330 to 1342.

In spite of the strictures of Bury on papal provisions, he took full advantage of the system. He was by this time a considerable pluralist, acquiring and exchanging rectories and prebends, or losing them by the failure of the papal machinery to carry an expressed wish into effect. His first rectory, Sawbridgeworth in Hertfordshire, he probably held as early as 1312.[2]

But he still had benefices worth less than 20 marks a year, as is stated in a letter written before 1313. This letter is described by Dean Kitchen as " a record of the intention of Edward III "—at that date Edward was one year old—" to heap preferments upon Bury's shoulders." I do not know that before Edward came to the throne Bury acquired any further livings. But in 1327 he became Rector of Croydon and received also the prebend of Crediton, in the diocese of Exeter. Next year, when he becomes Keeper and Treasurer of the Wardrobe, another rectory and another prebend.

It was not until he became Privy Seal in 1329 that the flow of benefices reached its maximum. So many are mentioned in connexion with his name that it is difficult to be certain how many he held at any particular moment. Nevertheless, the main facts emerge clearly enough. In June 1329 he is provided to a canonry and prebend of York, notwithstanding that he has others at Chichester, London and Crediton, and is also a rector, and is Chaplain to the Queen.[1] By October 1330 he has become canon of Wells and now has a different prebend at Exeter, and another at Salisbury. So at this time he has at least six prebends and possibly more, and was receiving in addition grants of land.[2]

---

[1] I attempt a provisional list of these preferments in Appendix, I.

[2] He is described as R. de B., rector of S., in a letter mentioned above.

As Privy Seal he was deep in the confidence of the King, but contrived to keep in with all parties, for as late as the middle of October 1330 his appointment at Wells is described as being made at the request of the King and the two Queens, Isabella and Philippa, and on October 20, 1330, Mortimer fell from power. This appointment was no doubt in part a result of Bury's visit to Avignon in this year.[3] The result of this embassy is given in a letter in the *Calendar of Papal Letters* where Richard is disguised (in text and index) as Richard de Burn.[4] The ambassadors had delivered their letters in June [5] and had asked the Pope whether it would be advisable for the King to go and reform Ireland. Pope John XXII replied with great good sense, about their being two kinds of Irishmen—mixed and pure—and the necessity of finding similar persons to govern them and that the King would be well advised to stay at home if there were any danger in Ireland.[6]

We do not know when the ambassadors returned to England, but we know that in April (between April 4 and April 20) and on 6 May, 1331, Bury was with the King on what Professor Tout describes as " his sudden and mysterious visit to France." They went to meet Philip VI at Pont-Sainte-Maxence.[7]

It was for this reason—that he might accompany the King to France—that Bury did not again go with Anthony de Pessagne to Avignon.[1] He was at this time, as Professor Tout has pointed out,[2] regarded as quite indispensable to the King, and on this French expedition he acted not only as Privy Seal but as a kind of paymaster-general. When he came back to England he was not long left in peace, for in April 1332 he and others were commissioned to visit the University of Cambridge and inquire into the state of the King's scholars there, and no doubt it was at this time that he became a member of the gild of St. Mary.[3] In January 1333 he is still Privy Seal and, like all medieval magnates, he is in debt.[4] But for the greater part of the year, from 20 February to 20 November he was abroad, sent upon a second mission to Avignon. It seems likely that before he went, he resigned the Privy Seal, but the dates are uncertain.[5] At Avignon Bury met Petrarch, who tells us in his letters that Bury would not or could not answer him.[6] Petrarch wanted to know where *ultima Thule* was, and Bury said that he had not got his books with him, but would write when he got back. He never did so, however, and Petrarch's repeated enquiries met with no reply. It seems still uncertain whether this meeting took place in 1330 or 1333. I incline to the latter date, but it is of more importance in Petrarch's life than in that of Richard de Bury.[7] To us, what is important is that Petrarch found Bury "*vir*

---

[1] *Cal. Pap. Lett.*, II, 294.

[2] *C.P.R.* (1331–3), p. 81.

[3] The account of his expenses is in P.R.O., Var., Accts., 310/40.

[4] *Cal. Pap. Lett.*, II, 500. But as he is styled canon of York and Anthony Pessagne, Kt., is his colleague, there can be no reasonable doubt of identity. The embassy is alluded to in *Foed.*, II, ii, 827 (25 Oct., 1331).

[5] The acknowledgment is dated 1 July.

[6] They also asked about the Crusade.

[7] Tout, *Chapters*, III, 6–7.

---

[1] Déprez, *Les Préliminaires*, p. 74, note 1. Apparently connected with the proposed expedition is the power, soon withdrawn, to these two ambassadors to borrow 50,000 marks in the King's name (Tout, *Chapters* III, 7, note 2). See also *C.P.R.* (1330–4), p. 122.

[2] *Loc. cit.*

[3] Masters-Lamb, *C. C. C. C.*, p. 16. *C.P.R.* (1330–4), p. 291.

[4] *C.Cl.R.* (1330–3), p. 518. Melton's register (under Feb. 12) records a loan of 50 marks to Dan Richard de Bury, Canon of York (Raine, *Fasti Ebor.*, pp. 420–1). In 1335 Bury received a pardon of all his debts to the King (*C.P.R.* (1334–8), p. 109).

[5] Tout, *Chapters*, V, 5, Déprez, *Les préliminaires* . . ., 94, note 2, and *C.P.R.* (1330–4), pp. 408, 409, 421, all relate to this mission.

[6] *Epp. fam.*, III, i. "Quamvis saepe litteris interpellatus exspectationi meae non aliter quam obstinato silentio satisfecit."

[7] Thomas, *Philobiblon*, p. xv, puts this meeting in the *first* visit. Tatham, *Francesco Petrarch*, I, pp. 313 ff., puts it in 1333. This account contains, however, a number of inaccuracies.

ardentis ingenii, nec litterarum inscius, abditarum rerum ab adolescentia supra fidem curiosus." Bury was certainly the earnest seeker after knowledge, though it must remain uncertain to what extent he attained it. With Petrarch, as with Burley, and even the memorial table at Durham, the praise seems to be qualified. Bury is *literatus*, but only *sufficienter*.

From Chambre's biography it is known that Bury, when visiting the Pope, had with him twenty clerks and thirty-six esquires, all in his livery. One way or another, perhaps by delivering some of the speeches in his letter-book, he impressed the Pope sufficiently to become, in July, a Papal Chaplain,[1] and to procure advancement for a kinsman, Mr. Thomas de Aungerville, M.A., who became Canon (and prebendary) of Wells.[2] This embassy may be regarded as eminently successful from Bury's point of view.

At Avignon Bury had been promised the next vacant English bishopric. While he was on the way back, Louis de Beaumont, the unlearned Bishop of Durham, died (25 September, 1333) and Bury (14 October) was papally provided to the See.[3] Meanwhile the monks of Durham elected one of their number, Robert de Graystanes. But Bury had the King, as well as the Pope, behind him, and Graystanes, although consecrated by the Archbishop of York, was unable to obtain royal confirmation and had to withdraw. The temporalities were restored to Bury on 7 December[4]; on 19 December he was consecrated in Chertsey Abbey, the Bishop of Lincoln paying all the expenses at the King's command[5]; on 10 January following he was installed by proxy, and enthroned in person with great pomp and ceremony on 5 June, 1334.[1] Four months earlier he had been made Lord Treasurer, and in September (28th) he became Lord Chancellor, an office which he held for only nine months.[2]

---

[1] *Cal. Pap. Lett.*, II, 341–2, without date.

[2] *Ibid.*, II, 332. Thomas also got the rectory of Sawbridgeworth when Bury became Dean of Wells in 1333. He remained in England as one of his brother's attorneys (*C.P.R.* (1334–8), p. 303), but died before 26 April, 1339 (*Reg. Pal. Dun.*, III, 232).

[3] It cost him 9,000 florins at 3*s*. 4*d*. a florin, plus 5 *servitia consueta* (*Richard D'Aungerville of Bury* (Surtees Soc., 1910), ed. by the Dean of Durham, p. 9).

[4] *C.P.R.*; *Reg. Pal. Dun.*, IV, 179.

[5] Chambre.

In the brief space of twelve months he had risen from a position still accounted of second-rate political importance to the wealthiest bishopric and the highest administrative post in the land. This year, 1333–4, may be regarded as a turning-point in Bury's life. His real importance in English history—apart from any influence he may have had on the young Edward of Windsor—begins when he becomes Privy Seal in 1329. In this capacity he revealed his talents and increased the dignity and importance of his office. But he was clearly not contented. On his second and prolonged visit to Avignon in 1333 he seems to have envisaged a renewal of his scholastic life. Perhaps his meeting with Petrarch had fired anew his academic ambitions. At any rate he procured from the Pope a dispensation to absent himself from his newly-acquired Deanery of Wells in order to study for three years at a University.[3] As he had already taken his B.D., and later professed a dislike of law, this is likely to have been for the purposes of advanced research in theology. We cannot say what the cause of scholarship has lost by his promotion to the Bishopric of Durham, theTreasurership, and Chancellorship. If Murimuth is right he obtained his Bishopric by his own ambition and at the request of the magnates.[4] We should not otherwise know that Bury was *persona grata* with the lay nobility, but there is a ring of truth about this. Chambre tells us that when in Paris Bury heard of Lewis de Beaumont's death, his clerk William de Tickhill urged him to write to the Pope for the vacant see of Durham, but he would not ask for that or any other bishopric. This inspires

[1] Chambre.

[2] *Foed.*, II, ii, 909. Bury gave up the Seal on 6 June, 1335.

[3] 25 Aug. 1333, *Cal. Pap. Lett.*, II, p. 392. Tout (*Chapters*, V, 7) regards this as merely " a plausible excuse for absence from his Deanery."

[4] Murimuth (R. S.), p. 171.

more faith in Chambre's loyalty—perhaps, too, his veracity—than in his common sense.

As Chancellor Bury probably found the routine irksome, like his immediate predecessors, he held the Great Seal for only a brief period. He had the valuable privilege of being able to dispose of all royal benefices with less than twenty marks a year, which was no doubt often commuted for books. But it may be that the arrears of work with which the Chancery of that date was burdened made the office difficult to fill. Or it may be truer to think that he was recognised as a better diplomat than civil servant.

Bury's associations with Oxford were not at an end. Shortly before he was appointed Chancellor of England he was made a Commissioner, with the Bishops of Coventry and Norwich, to inquire into the disturbances which had led to the secession to Stamford.[1] In this capacity he may have stayed at Merton, for there is in a chaplain's account at that College a payment of £3 12*s.* as livery to the clerks, esquires, and servants of Mr. Richard de Bury.[2] We shall see later that a number of Bury's chaplains were fellows of Merton.

In 1336 a truce was made with the Scots and Bury was free to undertake other work. On July 6 he was appointed with the Bishop of Winchester, William Trussel, and Mr. Richard de Bynteworth, LL.D., to treat with Philip of France, concerning the crusade, disputes in Aquitaine, and particularly the Scotch war.[3] The embassy left on 12 July and returned at Michaelmas. Bury received £100 down—which would not go very far—and was allowed five marks a day plus his expenses.[4] On this embassy we find acting as messenger one John de Bury, perhaps a relative, and the inevitable William de Tickhill, who had in 1333 urged his master when they were in Paris to write to the Pope for the vacant Bishopric of Durham. William's position seems to have been rather that of a private secretary.[1] Roger Daungerville, another kinsman, went too.[2]

---

[1] *Foed.*, II, ii, 892; *C.P.R.* (1334–8), p. 66.

[2] *Hist. MSS. Comm.*, 6th Rep., App., p. 548 (Merton College Archives).

[3] *C.P.R.* (1334–8), p. 301.

[4] *C.Cl.R.* (1333–7), 596, 622, 628, and (1337–9), p. 514. The account of Richard's expenses are in P.R.O., Var. Acct., 311/22 (6 July–29 Sept., 1336).

This mission was admittedly a failure, but Bury was not left long in peace.[3] Next year he was three times appointed to explain to Great Councils at York and Newcastle the plans for an invasion of Scotland.[4] He was called away from this work to undertake his last and most magnificent embassy. He and the Archbishop of Canterbury were given full powers, on 21 June, to treat with France, but a little later in the same year (1338), the king decided to go in person to Flanders. He sailed on 16 July and the powers to Bury and the others were revoked when they landed at Antwerp on 22 July.[5] There seems to have been considerable indecision in this matter, as Bury was again appointed to treat with France on 15 November and this too was at once revoked,[6] only to be renewed a month later.[7] During this time Bury was with the royal court, which left Antwerp on 16 August, 1338, and progressed up the Rhine to Cologne (23 September). This expedition, amazingly costly in subsidies to German allies who quickly faded out of the war with France, is vividly described by Pauli in his *Bilder aus Alt-England.*[8] Edward III was out of England for some fifteen months. From 9 April to at least 15 May, 1339, Bury was at Antwerp with the court, and again in August at Brussels. In September, while the King was still on the borders of France, he was sent home, with the

---

[1] In 1341 he was sent to Rome as Bury's proctor (*Reg. Pal. Dun.*, III, p. 360).

[2] *C.P.R.* (1334–8), p. 304. He was probably younger than Richard, as in 1335 he received a respite from knighthood for two years (*ibid.*, 118). He also accompanied the Bishop in 1338 (*C.Cl.R.*, 1337–9, p. 616). By 1344 he had become a knight, and on the 30th of September in that year, when Bury no doubt realized that he had not long to live, was given a pension of £10 a year (*Reg. Pal. Dun.*, III, p. 374).

[3] *Foed.*, II, ii, 944.

[4] *Ibid.*, 963, 979, 1000.

[5] *C.P.R.* (1338–40), pp. 101, 190.

[6] *C.P.R.* (1338–40), pp. 194.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 196.

[8] (1860) 118 ff., from the wardrobe accounts.

Archbishop and William de la Pole, to negotiate with Parliament for money.[1] It had been a costly and, in the long run, a fruitless mission, in which Bury's expenses (12 July, 1338, to 10 October, 1339) alone amounted to over £1,500.[2] But he had made himself personally agreeable to the Emperor, and the Pope wrote to him on behalf of the Bishop of Cambrésis, whom the Emperor was attacking.[3]

Bury was one of the few who survived the official crisis of 1340 without falling into temporary disgrace. When he came home he was associated with Percy, Neville, and Scrope, in appointing new collectors of the customs, and for the ninth and fifteenth, and other duties concerning the payment of the army.[4] He had also to examine the accounts of his late ambassadorial colleague, William de la Pole, for sales of wool, and had at the same time to treat with the men of the northern parts for the defence of the border against the Scots, to whom he was sent as ambassador in April 1340.[5] A special commission of *Oyer* and *Terminer* was appointed to deal with trespasses on his Yorkshire estates.[6] He was, furthermore, one of the commission, in 1341, to hear the charges against Archbishop Stratford.[7]

His activity in the North, at that time in a very disturbed state,[8] dragged on into 1342 and 1343, when he is described as the man " whom the King has appointed to ordain concerning wages for magnates and others staying in that county upon the war of Scotland for the defence of the realm." [1] In this, too, he was associated chiefly with Percy, Neville and Scrope, though sometimes he had other colleagues.[2] The events of these years bring out very clearly the position of the Bishops of Durham in the North, in many ways analogous to that of the Archbishops of Cologne in the tenth and eleventh centuries. They were not only spiritual potentates and bishops of immense wealth. They were Pro-consuls, or provincial viceroys, upon whose loyalty depended the safety of the land north of Trent,[3] and their work as bishops was subordinated to this.[4] But Bury found time in these years to conduct a thorough visitation of Durham Priory.[5]

---

[1] *C.P.R.* (1338–40), pp. 371–2, 383, 394. He with the Archbishop and Cardinals had left the court some time before. The King went to Malines and they to Arras, according to Murimuth (p. 85).

[2] P.R.O., Var. Acct., 311/36. He was, however, allowed only £1,341 4*s*. 11*d*. (*C.Cl.R.*, 1339–41, p. 358).

[3] *Rich. D'Aung. of Bury*, pp. 134–7.

[4] *C.P.R.* (1338–40), pp. 507, 516 and (1340–3), p. 28: cf. *C.Cl.R.* (1339–41), pp. 582, 597.

[5] *Foed.*, II, ii, 1122, 1171, 1175, 1183. There was a commission to France, probably revoked, in the next year (*Ibid.*, 1156, 1158, cf. *Philobiblon*, ed. Thomas, p. xxii).

[6] *C.P.R.* (1338–40), pp. 482, 486; (1340–3) pp. 87, 253; *C.Cl.R.* (1339–41), pp. 431, 488; (1341–3) pp. 18, 21.

[7] Murimuth, p. 120.

[8] *C.P.R.* (1340–3), p. 328; (1343–5), pp. 67, 88.

It seems likely, for Chambre uses the phrase *longa infirmitate decoctus*, that for much of the last three years of his life Bury was ill. He was not summoned to Parliament in 1342, there are no more embassies or commissions, after his appointment to treat with Bruce in April of that year,[6] and from charter evidence he is found at his manors endowing with offices for life those who had served him. He died on 14 April, 1345,[7] shortly after finishing the *Philobiblon*, at his manor of Auckland, and was buried on 21 April in Durham cathedral.[1]

---

[1] *C.Cl.R.* (1340–3), p. 585; (1343–6) p. 172.

[2] Examples of this administrative activity in 1640–2 are in *Rot. Scot.*, I, pp. 592, 603, 621 (diplomatic negotiations), 596, 601, 602, 606, 607, 608 (movement and payment of troops). In similar mandates of 1643 Bury is not named. He appears again once in Aug. 1344 (p. 652), either through a Chancery error, or perhaps because he had temporarily recovered.

[3] This is well expressed in *Foed.*, II, i, 506.

[4] Lists of ordinations have survived for Bury's pontificate, and show that he was active only in 1336 and 1341–2 (*Reg. Pal. Dun.*, III, 111, 115, 123, 172). The same source shows that the bishop of Carlisle or the bishop of Corbaria frequently acted for him in the earlier period, and Richard, bishop of Bisaccia, in 1341–5.

[5] Nevertheless, the visitation of Whitby in 1366 revealed that the moral condition of Durham Priory had long been bad. I am indebted to Dr. Hubert Hall for bringing this to my notice: see W. A. Pantin, *Chapters of the English Black Monks*, 1215–1540 (Camden Soc., 1937), Vol. III, pp. 277–309.

[6] *Ibid.*, II, ii, 1191.

[7] Murimuth, p. 171.

§ 4. CONCLUSION

This rise from a lowly position as the son of a mere knight, to the peak of ambition as Chancellor of England and Bishop of Durham, is reminiscent of the equally remarkable rise of men like William the Marshal or Grossetête. It is a record of continuous success, for Bury was never out of favour, and, so far as we know, never in opposition to those he served between 1325 and 1345. The many embassies and commissions upon which he was employed attest his ability as a diplomat. It is clear enough from the *Philobiblon* that he was formal, discreet, and without much originality. It seems likely that he felt more at home when visiting the Pope or the King of France, or even the Bruce, than when working in the Wardrobe, Privy Seal, or Chancery. He was playing, under Edward III, a part in many ways similar to that of Henry de Lacy, Walter Langton (his first master), or Otho de Grandison, forty years earlier. In the *Philobiblon* he appears for the most part as a strong character and a man of taste, if somewhat flamboyant and pretentious. His style is strongly marked by his unusually able use of the *cursus*, his employment of puns, and his affectation of odd words. He himself described it as *levissimo stylo modernorum*. In some ways he was a man of the early Renaissance—as a collector of manuscripts, as a man of real intellectual curiosity—and we must, I think, admit that Thomas's usually fine judgment failed him when he changed his view upon coming across the chronicle of Murimuth, at that time being re-edited for the Rolls Series, and wrote *Was Bury an Impostor?* So far as is known Bury wrote nothing except the *Philobiblon*, composed in the last few months of his life, and some sermons known only from the

---

[1] His remains, discovered in modern times, show that he was over 6 feet tall. For the circumstances of his death and burial, see *Rich. D'Aung. of Bury*, pp. xlii–xlvii.

Leicester Abbey Catalogue,[1] and compiled nothing except his *Liber Epistolaris*. The attribution of other works to him has always proved erroneous. But his influence was important, his *Philobiblon* was known at Oxford in 1358,[2] and in the fifteenth century, if not earlier, achieved a considerable reputation upon the Continent.[3] From the number of manuscripts known to exist or to have existed, and from the number of printed editions,[4] it must be ranked as a work of permanent and widespread interest. As a book, illustrative of the times, it deserves to be more widely read. The question of authorship must remain within the shadow of doubt until a pedigree of the manuscripts has been attempted.[5]

We may doubt if Bury was the perfect official: the rapidity with which he relinquished the Chancellorship seems to point to this. Moreover, he never leaves an office without getting a pardon for not accounting. He was treated with great generosity, he was given the richest bishopric in England, and yet he died in debt.[6] Part of this was no doubt due to his love of books, then a luxury to all but the richest, and to his great charity, attested by his biographer, but in large measure it must have been due to his extravagance—his fondness for vain show and pomp. Older writers have thought that Bury imparted to Edward III "some share of his own affection for books," [7] and it may indeed be no chance that Edward was the first English King whom we know to have been able to write, but it is more likely that Bury's influence is to be sought, if anywhere, in Edward's love of doing things on the grand scale.

---

[1] Nicholls, *Leicestershire*, II, i, App. 104. (The fifteenth-century Leicester Abbey library catalogue.)

[2] *Philobiblon*, ed. Thomas, cap. vi, pp. 51–2. Anstey, *Mun. Acad.*, i, 207–8.

[3] Thomas à Kempis took a whole chapter from Bury, as did Matthäus Hummel for a speech at the opening ceremony of the University of Freiburg in 1460. See Axel Nelson's works cited below, p. 34, note 2.

[4] There have been English, German, French, Italian, American, and Norwegian editions.

[5] One minor point, though obvious, does not seem to have drawn any comment: the colophon of even the best manuscripts must be interpolated. The *quondam episcopi* is not consistent with the *nostro manerio*, etc.

[6] Murimuth, p. 171.

[7] Thomas, *Philobiblon*, p. xiii, citing Dibdin, *Bibliomania*, pp. 118–19.

For Bury was not primarily a scholar. From the time when he entered Edward's service, at about the age of 25,[1] he can have had little opportunity to undertake serious study until, perhaps, the last three years of his life, during much of which he was ill. But this does not mean that he was an ignoramus. His career and the evidence of the *Philobiblon* show that, even if he did not know where *Ultima Thule* was, he was well educated. The precise extent of his knowledge we could not hope to know. He would certainly have liked us to believe that he knew more than most people, and the truth seems to be that he probably did. He may not have been as good a Greek scholar as Bacon, and he certainly knew less than Grossetête, but there is reason to think that he was not entirely ignorant of the language. He had the opportunity, for the period covered by his probable residence in Oxford saw a revived, if ephemeral interest in the matter, which is apparent in Clement V's decree at the Council of Vienne for the establishment of Hebrew, Greek, Arabic, and Chaldean lectureships at Oxford and elsewhere. They were to be supported by ecclesiastical taxation, and, as Dr. Little has shown, such taxes were certainly levied between 1320 and 1325.[2] Furthermore, the Franciscan School at Oxford had had a Greek and Hebrew tradition since the time of Roger Bacon.[3] Finally, when Walter Burley translated the Ethics and

---

[1] There were a number of Doctors in the fourteenth-century Civil Service, but if they had fulfilled the requirements of the Oxford curriculum as known from fifteenth-century sources, they must have spent about twelve years at the University before embarking upon an official career. Starting as mere boys at Oxford, scholars could gain European fame before they were 30 in the Middle Ages, but if they were going to be King's Clerks they might have to be content with a reputation acquired in middle age. Civil Servants were 40 or 50 before they reached the top.

[2] A. G. Little, *Studies in English Franciscan History*, pp. 216–18.

[3] *Ibid.*, 213 ff.

Politics of Aristotle at Bury's request he said, rather surprisingly in the proem to his dedication, that he was *totaliter ignarus* of Greek, but that Bury, being *sufficienter in isto ydiomate* (*instructus*) had helped him. This explicit statement occurs in more than one manuscript,[1] and though it may be minimised, can hardly be ignored.

With Hebrew the opportunity was naturally greater, but there is no evidence. And so when Bury bewails the prevailing ignorance of these languages, pointing out that the failure to understand one word may stultify the whole business of translation, and states that he has had grammars in Hebrew and Greek prepared for his students, we are inclined to believe that he had at Oxford acquired more than a bowing-acquaintance with these tongues.

He was not, however, a specialist. By education a theologian, he had the Vulgate at his finger-tips, and he also defends the study of the secular classics. But he held no brief for law. The *Philobiblon*, crowded with Biblical and patristic allusions, scoffs at Gratian as a formless and plagiaristic writer.[2] For he was himself, in spite of all the nonsense that has been talked about his work, essentially a stylist. The key to the style of the *Philobiblon*, which all writers seem to have missed, in that it is written strictly according to the rules of the *Cursus Curie Romane*. Some writers, like Dante, adopted a broader interpretation of what rhythmical prose meant, but none obeyed more strictly than Bury, not even the composers of papal bulls, the rules of the three endings—*Planus*, *Tardus*, and *Velox*—which made up the medieval theory of the mode in which he wrote —*levissimo stylo modernorum*. In his obedience to rule, in his subtle use of compound *clausulæ*, in all the rhetorical devices of the age, he is unexcelled.

I need not here go into the manuscript problems presented by the *Philobiblon*—the matter being in substantially the same state as when Father Ghellinck wrote—apart from pointing out that the knowledge that it is written with the strictest regard for rhythm will much simplify the setting up of the definitive text for which we still wait.[1] This simple observation has vindicated the homogeneity of the book and adds further weight to the remark already made by others, that the style is not that of Robert Holcot.

---

[1] MS. New Coll., ccxlii; Vat. lat. 2153, fol. 1. B.M., MS. Burney 304, fol. 1.

[2] *Philobiblon*, ed. Thomas, pp. 98, 108.

As a man who knew the meaning of words Bury was invaluable in the conduct of diplomacy. The success of his earlier embassies probably did more than his conduct in the Privy Seal office to mark him down as the candidate of the King and his nobles for the bishopric of Durham. He was clearly a man of vigorous personality, who in a broad way was a good organiser. It was no doubt this, rather than his qualities as a spiritual leader, which sent him to the Palatinate. He was one who liked to be his own master, and as bishop of Durham he in practice was. In this, as in everything he touched, he was successful. It is during his Pontificate that the Durham chancery records begin,[2] and the statement of Chambre that he preserved the liberties of the Palatinate is amply borne out by the evidence of his register and of the public records.[3] For although he worked harmoniously with Edward III throughout his public career, he indulged in litigation lasting a number of years with the Crown over rights of presentation. For the fabric of the cathedral and castle he did little or nothing, though he bequeathed or gave many vestments.

---

[1] For the *Cursus* as a weapon of textual criticism, see Toynbee, *The Bearing of the Cursus on the Text of Dante's De vulgari eloquentia*. The best edition of the *Philobiblon* is now that of Axel Nelson (Stockholm, 1922), whose work has not been superseded by Dr. M. J. Husung's German edition (Weimar, 1931). For both, see *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, vols. 27 (1920), p. 105; 39 (1922), p. 381; 40 (1923), p. 29; 45 (1929), p. 69; and especially 49 (1932), p. 86.

[2] G. T. Lapsley, *The County Palatine of Durham* (Harvard Historical Series, vol. viii, 1900), p. 329. Cf. *ibid.*, 145–6, for Bury's council in 1345, consisting of thirteen persons: " steward, chancellor, five justices, sheriff of Durham, one of the coroners, one cleric, and two tenants-in-chief "—though there were eleven barons of the Palatinate. The chancellor was also Receiver, and Constable of Durham Castle (see *Reg. Pal. Dun.*, Rolls Series, III, pp. 208 ff., for a considerable fragment of Bury's Register).

[3] Further instances of Bury's great administrative activity after 1338 are given in *Rich. D'Aung. of Bury*, pp. xxvii ff.

But Bury was not only the cultured pro-consul. He was the greatest patron of his age and the greatest bibliophile in medieval Europe. This is the most fascinating aspect of his life, and it constitutes a cogent claim to fame. The able and penetrating study of this side of Bury's activity by Father Ghellinck makes it unnecessary to do more than mention the facts that he used both friars and monks as his agents in book-collecting,[1] though he castigates both for having fallen into slothful ways: that he had his own scribes, correctors, and illuminators at work in the Palatinate. His great charity is described by his admirer Chambre: his extravagance and consequent poverty by the less charitable Murimuth.

The gifted circle of literary men who gathered around him has been noticed more than once, but the results of their labours has not been ascribed to his inspiration. Professor Powicke has remarked that " I venture to think that the wider, the less systematic and less professional range of the books which came to Merton after the middle of the fourteenth century reflects the influence of this humanistic interest in the fellows who were associated with Bradwardine." [2] Three of the fellows in question were chaplains of Richard de Bury. They do not make up the quota named by the Bishop's biographer, but those who do not appear are not Merton men, and though equally successful from a worldly point of view, they are not so great (except Holcot) as scholars. The two greater of them—Bradwardine [1] and Burley [2]—were associated with him at least ten years before his death. The matter is ripe for further investigation, but already it seems not unfair to assume that the influence of Bradwardine originally found its inspiration in de Bury. He had beyond doubt, a remarkable circle of chaplains, who shared with him the daily readings at table, and the disputations after dinner.[3]

---

[1] There can be no doubt that Bury was a great book-collector. There is the evidence of Chambre, *Iste summe delectabatur in multitudine librorum,* Murimuth's grudging admission *licet idem episcopus fuisset mediocriter literatus, volens tamen magnus clericus reputari, recollegit sibi librorum numerum infinitum, tam de dono quam ex accomodato a diversis monasteriis et ex empto, adeo quod quinque magne carectae non sufficiebant pro ipsius vectura librorum* (p. 171), and the clear statement of Petrarch.

[2] F. M. Powicke, *The Medieval Books of Merton College,* Oxford, 1931, p. 25.

Some of these were men associated with him in his diplomatic activities. Burley was on the French mission in 1338, Richard de Kilvington with him in Flanders a little later. For the most part they were not young men, but his contemporaries, or older. His chaplains were proved scholars rather than men of struggling talent. But he was equally generous to the lesser folk who served him. By 1343 he seems to have realised that the end was not far off, for we find him appointing members of his household to positions for life upon his estates, and this may be an indication of his wish to provide for them.

He was a warm-hearted man, and we are not surprised to find that his earlier relations as a book-borrower with Bermondsey Priory are complemented by his later defence of their interests. Though his proposed foundation of a Hall at Oxford failed to materialise, apparently from lack of funds, it must not be forgotten that he had already endowed a little College of four chaplains at Hoghton. Two to study theology and two canon and civil law, till they should attain the degree of doctor.[4] This, his support of Bentworth, a civilian, and the fact that the great canonist John of Atton was one of his most important *clerici fami-*

---

[1] Chaplain to Bury in 1335 (*D.N.B.*). M.A. before 1323. On the French mission 1338. Died 1349.

[2] Bury got Burley pardoned of all trespasses of vert and venison in Dec. 1336 (*C.P.R.*, 1334–8, p. 341).

[3] I give their names in Appendix for convenience.

[4] *Cal. Pap. Lett.*, III, 137–8.

liares [1] I take as an example of his broadmindedness. For law was not congenial to him.

Further, it was at his instance that Sir Philip de Somerville founded six theological fellowships at Balliol in 1340,[2] and he was one of the royal Commissioners to examine the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. If we hesitate to call him a humanist, he was certainly a champion of the higher education. The criticism aroused by his passionate love of books seems to have distressed him and he tells us himself that he wrote the *Philobiblon* as his Apologia, showing why men must love books and pointing out that it was his intention to endow a Hall at Oxford and give his library to it. For he had collected more books than all the bishops in England. Even in his bedroom one tripped over books stacked on the floor. Why people should object to this,—as he obviously did not pursue his hobby to the neglect of his duties—is difficult to see. I cannot help feeling that his chief critic, Adam Murimuth, scholar and diplomat like himself, was one in whom the flow of acidulated prose was quickened by the thought that he had been passed in the race for official promotion.

The fate of Bury's famous library except for one or two books [3] will probably always remain in doubt. It has frequently been asserted, even by well known scholars, that it in one way or another came to Oxford.[4] Of this, however, there is no shadow of proof. It is certain, as might have been suspected, that few, if any, of the books reached the priory library at Durham. I was convinced of this after a rapid search through the manuscripts now there. It is also likely that Bury died in debt, and likely that his library was sold by his executors. This seems probable from the testimony of Murimuth,[1] and from the way in which the executors were treated by the Crown. At first they received special favour. All the bishop's acquittances from the Crown were to stand, and royal officials were forbidden to take advantage, as they would normally have done, of the vacancy, because of the special affection which the King had for Bury.[2] But in a few months matters were on a much more mercenary basis, and the executors were commanded to distrain for debts due to Bury and keep them to the King's use.[3]

---

[1] Atton is expressly identified for us as canon of Lincoln. He occurs in the surviving records in 1342–4, and played an important part in the visitation of Durham priory (*Rich. D'Aung. of Bury*, p. 148, and see the Index thereto). Atton was *juris utriusque professor* (*ibid.*, 151).

[2] Workman, *Wyclif*, i, 75 ; *C.P.R.* (1338–40), pp. 347, 416, 423. For the statutes, see *Reg. Pal. Dun.*, III, pp. 381–406, 582–98.

[3] Three St. Albans MSS.—Royal MSS. 8G I and 13D IV and Bod. Lib. MS. Laud. misc. 363—are known to have belonged to Bury.

[4] Some useful references are given in Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. by Powicke and Emden, vol. iii, pp. 186–7.

And so passes from English history an actor who had played his part for twenty-five years with unswerving devotion to the master he served. He was not a man of outstanding greatness, neither was Edward III, but he was eminently successful, and, unlike his master, he had the good fortune to die before the ambitions of his life had plainly been frustrated.

[1] P. 171.

[2] *C.P.R.* (1343–6), p. 455.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 515.

APPENDIX

I. ROYAL MS. 12 D. XI.

Some of the letters in this manuscript have been thought to relate to Richard de Bury, e.g. fol. 12^v, " Pape Rex, etc." *Experta fidelitas*, describing " R. de B." as *secretarius noster carissimus*, Keeper of the Privy Seal, *magister in artibus et juris civilis professor*. It states that the Pope will remember B.'s previous visit and that the Deanery of Lincoln is vacant by the promotion of W. to the Bishopric of Norwich.

The Catalogue gives 1336–7 as the date of many of the letters, but points out that one must be as late as 1344. This is important to us because the Catalogue suggests that the person concerned was Richard de Bury. This, however, is unlikely from (1) the dates of the other letters, (2) R. de B. is described as *juris civilis professor* (Bury did not like law) and (3) as Privy Seal, which Bury gave up in 1333. No amount of manipulation can fit this into Bury's career, for if it were he the date could only be 1333, referring back to his first visit to Avignon, and when neither the Deanery of Lincoln nor the Bishopric of Norwich were vacant : William de Ayremynne had the latter from 1325–36 and Antony Bek was Dean of Lincoln in 1329, succeeding Ayremynne as Bishop of Norwich in 1336.

There is, however, no need to say with the Royal Catalogue that the initials are wrong and should refer to John Ufford, who got the Deanery of Lincoln in 1344, when William Bateman became Bishop of Norwich. It is much more likely, palæographically, that A[nthony Bek], Dean of Lincoln, who occupied the same succession of offices, is meant by " W," and R. de B., is Richard de Bentworth, who in 1336 was Privy Seal, had been to Avignon, and *was juris civilis professor*. This at any rate tallies with the dates of the rest of the collection. It may be that we should read J. de U. for R. de B., but the probability is that this is Bentworth's formulary.

II. BURY'S CLERKS

This is not an account of the bishop's *familia*, but merely a collection of notes on some of the learned persons known to have been in his service. For Bradwardine, Kilvington, and Atton, there is new information.

Chambre gives:

THOMAS BRADWARDINE,[1] chaplain to Bury in 1335 (*Camb. Hist. Eng. Lit.*, i, 213). Abroad with Bury in 1338. Acted as Bury's proctor in London in 1340 (*Reg. Pal. Dun.*, III, pp. 490, 492). Archbishop of Canterbury, 1349. *d.* 1349.

THOMAS FITZ-RALPH, later Bishop of Armagh.

WALTER BURLEY,[1] the philosopher, reputed tutor to the Black Prince (Moisart, p. 21). Thirteen years older than Bury, to whom he dedicated his translations of Aristotle. *d.* 1345.

JOHN MAUDIT,[1] the mathematician.

ROBERT HOLCOT, the Dominican theologian, to whom the *Philobiblon* is ascribed in a number of manuscripts, *d.* 1349.

RICHARD DE KILVINGTON,[1] the philosopher, who became archdeacon of London in 1350. Abroad with Bury in 1338–9. Received in 1340 license to study in the schools for two years, though already S.T.P. With Bury's household again in 1342 (*Rich. D'Aung. of Bury*, p. 148).

Each of the above was S.T.P.

RICHARD BENTWORTH, *juris civilis* professor, later Bishop of London. One of Bury's successors as Privy Seal. See Appendix, I.

WALTER SEGRAVE, later Bishop of Chichester. In 1340 he was Treasurer of Chichester and Bury's chancellor, and was at York with him on December 8 (*Reg. Pal. Dun.*, III, 483).

To Chambre's list we may add:

JOHN OF ATTON (Athon, Acton, Atoun), at any rate in 1342–4. See above, pp. 161–2.

---

[1] Fellow of Merton.

III. Bury's Preferments

Benefice.	*Date.*	*Diocese.*	*Reference.*
Rectory of Sawbridgeworth	Before 1312	Canterbury	*C.P.L.*, II, 294, 342; *C.P.R.*, 1332, p. 383. Relinquished in 1332 to Thomas Daungerville (*supra*, p. 21, n. 2), *ibid.*, 374.
Rectory of Croydon	30 Nov. 1327	Winchester	*C.P.R.* (1327–30), pp. 191, 193.
Prebend of Crediton	2 Dec. 1327	Exeter	*Ibid.*, 191; Reg. Grand. i, 19; *Cal. Pap. Lett.*, II, 275.
Rectory of Doddington	18 Sept. 1328	Lincoln	*C.P.R.* (1327–30), p. 319.
Prebend of Hurst in royal chapel of Hastings	20 Oct. 1328[1]	Chichester	*Ibid.*, 324. *Cal. Pap. Lett.*, II, 275, Croydon and Crediton notwithstanding.
Canonry of York	13 June 1329	York	*Cal. Pap. Lett.*, II, 327. Notwithstanding that he has a canonry of Chichester with expectation of a prebend, and canonries and prebends of St. Martin le Grand, London, and of Crediton, and is rector of Sawbridgeworth. He is here described as "The Queen's chaplain" and (as also on p. 315) as Ricardus de Sancto Edmundo. He is still canon of York and S.T.B. in 1332 (MS. Ashmole 794, f. 45).

---

[1] See *Rich. D'Aungerville of Bury* (Surtees Soc.), pp. 246–9, 258, but these references are not mentioned in the Introduction. This book contains not only a fragment of Richard de Bury's register but a fine collec-

Benefice.	*Date.*	*Diocese.*	*Reference.*
Prebend of Wenlocksbarn	13 Jan. 1330	London	*C.P.L.*, ii, 327, 339 *Richard D'Aungerville of Bury* (Surtees Soc. 1910), p. 258. He was provided to another prebend at Salisbury at the same time.
Prebend of Dasset Parva	26 Jan. 1331	Lichfield	Brown Willis, *Cathedrals*, p. 437.
Prebend of Penryn	6 Mar. 1330	Exeter	*C.P.R.*, 495.
Archdeacon of Salisbury	7 July, revoked 25 Oct. 1330	Salisbury	*Ibid.*, II, 537. Le Neve, *Fasti*, ii, 623.
Prebend of Beaminster 2da	9 Oct. 1330	Salisbury	*Richard D'Aungerville of Bury* (Surtees Soc., 1910), p. 258.
Prebend of Wells	23 Oct. 1330	Bath and Wells	Provision at the request of the King and Queens Isabella and Philippa, notwithstanding that he has five canonries (named) and is rector of Sawbridgeworth (*C.P.L.*, II, p. 338).
Prebend of St. Botolph's	25 Oct. 1330	Lincoln	Le Neve, *Fasti*, II, 43; *Richard D'Aungerville of Bury* (Surtees Soc., 1910), p. 258.
	Exchanged in 1331 with Peter de Berkley for the prebend of Weston in Westbury, diocese of Worcester		*Ibid.*, 249.
Papal Chaplain	about 1 July, 1331	—	*C.P.L.*, II, p. 342. Cf. *Rich. D'Aung. of B.*, p. 2.
Canon of Losk in St. Patrick's, Dublin	16 Oct. 1332	—	*C.P.R.* (1330–4), p. 359.

tion of documents drawn from all sources relating to Bury's pontificate. Of these an inadequate use was made in the Introduction and notes. On p. 244, where Bury receives from the Pope the right of creating four notaries, we are told that " the office of *tabellio* was that of Town Clerk."

Benefice.	*Date.*	*Diocese.*	*Reference.*
Dean of Wells	20 Mar. 1337	—	*C.P.L.*, II, 385. Cf. 382, Indult to discharge his office of visitation by deputy for three years and to be non-resident in his deanery (29 July, cf. p. 393).

THE CHRONOLOGY OF LABOUR SERVICES[1]

By M. Postan, M.Sc., F.R.Hist.S.

Read, 11 March 1937

I

The chronology of labour services in the Middle Ages has been agitating agrarian historians for nearly a hundred years. In view of this it is surprising to find how many of the dates are still a matter of assumption. On the whole, economic historians know much more about the final demise of labour dues than about their previous history. (They may disagree as to the exact dates of the fourteenth-century commutation, or as to the extent to which England had been manorialised and was therefore likely to be affected by the dissolution of the manor. But, on the whole, they are agreed that commutation did take place in those parts of the country which were manorialised; and it would be generally accepted that commutation was rare in the first quarter of the fourteenth century, that labour services were exceptional in the last quarter of the fifteenth century, and that consequently the final substitution of money for labour dues took place some time between the first quarter of the fourteenth century and the first quarter of the fifteenth.)

This may not be much to show for half a century of research, but little as it is, it is a great deal more than is known about labour services in the preceding periods. Were they rising, stationary, or falling, and if they fell or rose how are the ups and downs to be dated? None of these questions have been answered, and for England as a whole they have not even been asked. And in the absence of definite knowledge, economic and constitutional historians have been thrown back on a series of purely conventional assumptions.

---

[1] The author intends to deal with some of the topics discussed in this paper at greater length in his forthcoming book on Manorial Profits.

Economic historians have been inclined to assume a gradual dissolution of the manorial structure, which extended over two or three centuries and was due to a gradually expanding money economy. This assumption usually enters their language and thoughts in the form of an adverbial figure. When students find money rents on thirteenth-century manors they regard labour services as "already commuted"; when they find them still enforced in the fifteenth century, they say that commutation has not "yet" begun. The adverbs are employed to register surprise, or to record what is thought to be a "local peculiarity." On the other hand, the general assumption of the constitutional historians, is that labour services in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were growing, in consequence of the clarification of the feudal and manorial structure under the Normans and Angevins. Services, it is held, became generalised and intensified as the manorial organisation crystallised and spread in the two or three centuries following the Conquest.

These two assumptions may appear to clash, though a useful chronological device for reconciling them can be, and has been found. It is indeed possible to hold both, by assigning the extension and the increase of labour services to a period which terminates with the Hundred Rolls; and their disappearance to the end of the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries, when economic forces began to play on the framework of the manor, gradually dissolving it.[1] But even if these two assumptions can be reconciled with each other, they are difficult to reconcile with the results of recent studies in other fields. The assumption of the increasing uniformity and rigidity of manorial forms in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries does not tally with what historians have recently told us about the active market in land in that period, the rapid process of subinfeudation, the morcellation of manors and vills, the traffic in land (especially in free land), amongst villeins and other tenants, and the traffic in manors, tenements and fees among the landlords. It is even more difficult to reconcile recent studies with the assumption of the gradual disappearance of labour services under the pressure of an expanding money economy. If services were disappearing with the growth of money economy, how is it that in the more backward parts of the country, farthest from great markets, above all in the north-west, labour services were shed first, while the more progressive south-east retained them longest?

---

[1] This appears to be Vinogradoff's view, though on occasions he appears to assume a constant tendency to commutation "checked during the feudal period by the scarcity of money." *Growth of the Manor*, p. 329. Cf. *Villeinage in England*, pp. 297–8, 307 and 181.

Indeed, the explanations underlying the assumed chronology of labour services are even more difficult to accept than the chronology itself, and the chief fault is not so much with the dates, as with the logic on which they are founded. That logic is simpler than is sometimes imagined; indeed, so simple as to be almost a truism. If labour services varied in quantity from manor to manor or from time to time, the cause of that variation was much more local and direct than the cosmic forces which historians have been in the habit of invoking. Given the social conditions of medieval England, a legal and political organisation dominated by feudal landlords and a working population largely composed of occupying landholders, labour services were a natural and easy way of meeting the landlord's demand for labour. Where these social conditions were present, and as long as they were maintained, the fluctuation of labour services requires no other explanation than that which is provided by the ordinary interplay of supply and demand—demand for villein service and supply of villein labour. And in so far as the cultivation of the demesne accounted for the demand, and the extent of villein settlement determined the supply, the differences between labour services exacted in different places were inevitably influenced by the relative areas of villeinage and demesne.

For England as a whole this connection may be impossible to establish. Differences in social structure and economy, in soil and methods of cultivation, could produce local variations in services, which overshadowed and concealed their relation to the size of the demesne. But within areas marked by similar geographical and social conditions labour services stood in an unmistakable relation to the needs of the demesne. The relation is evident in Professor Kosminsky's analysis of the large and small estates in the *Hundred Rolls*, but it would have stood out more clearly still, had he illustrated his arguments by the measurements of demesne lands in manors belonging to the same vills or the same lordships.[1] Take for instance the entry in the *Hundred Rolls* for Cottenham in Cambridgeshire. The village contained six manors, belonging respectively to the Abbot of Crowland, Gilbert of Cottenham, Robert de Insula, Simon le Waleys, Walter de Pelham and the village rector. On four of these roughly the same amount of money rent and labour services is imposed on each unit of villein land. The rent may vary from 4*s*. 6*d*. on one manor to 5*s*. 9*d*. on another, the value of the services from 1*s*. to 10½*d*., but roughly they are the same, especially if compared with those prevailing on the remaining two manors. These two manors stand in sharp contrast both to each other and to the rest of the village, for on one of them 1*s*. 9*d*. is paid in rent and 4*s*. 9*d*. is the value of labour services, while on the other only money rent is paid and no services are demanded or evaluated. The cause of the variation is not difficult to find: the proportion of villein to demesne land on the four similar manors is roughly the same, while the demesne is altogether absent from the manor which does not exact labour services and is proportionately larger than anywhere else on the one manor on which services are valued at the exceptionally high figure of 4*s*. 9*d*.

---

[1] Kosminsky, *The English Village in the Thirteenth Century*, Moscow, 1935 (Russian); "Rents and Labour Services, etc.," *Economic Hist. R.*, vol. v, No. 2.

The same is true of most vills on estates for which a similar comparison is possible, e.g. the Hertfordshire estates of St. Paul, the Fitz Hamme manors in Buckinghamshire, the Beauchamp estates in the South Midlands or the western group of the Peterborough estates. All these are groups of manors, each of which is situated within the same geographical and social area and belongs to the same lord; yet we find that within each group the labour services vary from manor to manor and that the variations reflect the differences in the relative sizes of the demesne.[1]

But if this is the true logic of the labour services it should account not only for differences between them, but also for their evolution. The changes from time to time, as well as the variations from place to place, are affected by the exigencies of demesne agriculture. When and where these exigencies change more quickly or more slowly than the supply of villein labour, the labour services should change accordingly. And such evidence as we have shows that they do.

II

The dimensions of both demesne and villein land fluctuated throughout the Middle Ages, but on the whole the fluctuations of the area under demesne cultivation were far more marked than those of the area in villeinage. Much as the village population may have changed, the core of villein land, at least before the fourteenth century, remained relatively stable. Therefore of the two elements in the equation—demesne and villeinage—the demesne was bound to exercise the stronger influence upon the evolution of labour dues. When the demand of the demesnes declined, the lords could dispense with some of the services previously required and the manorial documents would either contain the rubric of "services sold" or else record the progress of commutation. *Mutatis mutandis*, when and where the demand grew, the lord would not only exact the services in full, but would also try to impose additional obligations. This connection is generally admitted for the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; it is understood that the letting out of the demesne at the close of the Middle Ages, with a consequent curtailment of demesne cultivation, was accompanied by the commutation of labour services. What is not so well understood is that the connection was also responsible for certain general movements in the earlier centuries.

---

[1] P.R.O. Inq. Post Mort., *Hen. III* 7/3. Maxwell-Lyte, *Two Registers, etc.* Somerset Rec. Soc., vol. xxv, 1920. These and other examples will, I hope, be available in greater detail elsewhere.

Isolated and exceptional changes in labour services could occur at any time; a spendthrift heir, too long a vacancy, a slack and careless landlord, might lead to a decline of the demesne, and consequently to a relaxation of labour services. On the other hand a new broom, a reforming landlord or a competent abbot, might in time lead to the intensification and improvement of demesne cultivation, and to an increase in the customary services performed by the villeins. But in addition to these exceptional and sporadic movements in both directions, there were, in the four centuries for which reliable evidence exists, movements which were so general and so widespread as to suggest the possibility of distinct phases in the history of labour services.

Of these phases the least known and most unexpected is that which is revealed by the earliest manorial surveys. Manorial documents of the twelfth century show, on the bulk of the manors which they cover, labour services declining and the cultivation of the demesne receding. Some ten or eleven surveys compiled in the twelfth century, and two or three later surveys reflecting twelfth century conditions, have been investigated for the purposes of this enquiry, and nearly all of them exhibit the same trend.[1]

If historians of the last generation have failed to notice or to emphasise the direction of the twelfth-century changes, this has perhaps been due to the accident that the surveys best known to them happened to be those on which the trend is least noticeable. One of these is the twelfth-century survey of the estates of the Abbey of Peterborough, the so-called *Liber Niger Petroburgensis*, which was apparently compiled at some time in the third decade of the century. This document depicts manorial economy at its most robust.[2] With the sole exception of the sokemen on the Lincolnshire and on some of the Northamptonshire manors, and perhaps of the burgage tenants of Oundle and Kettering, the bulk of the Abbey's tenants are villeins discharging full labour services. But the fact that historians have been inclined to overlook the tendency towards commutation in the other well-known and most widely read twelfth-century survey, that of Glastonbury, is probably due more to the uncommunicative nature of the document, than to the actual conditions on the manors. Unlike the Black Book of Peterborough, the survey of Glastonbury reveals the existence of very large bodies of rent-paying tenants holding wholly or chiefly for money rent, especially on the outlying manors of the Abbey in Wiltshire, Dorset and Berkshire. Unfortunately the document, like most surveys, depicts a static condition, but unlike most of them contains very little evidence of recent changes. In the absence of these indications, to assume that the numerous money-paying tenants were a product of recent commutation would perhaps be to beg the question. Yet an observer with his eyes wide open, and his theories suspended, will find some indications even here; for the documents contain more than a score of references to land-grants and changes in tenurial conditions carried out during the rule of Abbot Henry of Blois (1126–71) and his successor, and with one or two exceptions all of these are grants of land to be held for money and commutation of villein tenures. Even more pointed are the references to the changes on the demesne. With the exception of two small additions to the demesne, most of the references concern leases to tenants. In the Wiltshire estate of Grittleton the whole manor is let out to the villagers, and there is hardly a manor on which portions of the demesne have not been leased, mostly by Abbot Henry.

---

[1] *Liber Niger Petroburgensis*, MS. 60 of the Soc. of Antiquaries. A photostat has been placed at my disposal by Mr. W. Mellows, whose generous assistance throughout my work on the Peterborough documents has been invaluable. The Camden Society's printed version has not been used here. *An Inquisition of the Manors of Glastonbury Abbey of the year* 1189, Roxburgh Club, 1882. W. H. Hart and P. A. Lyons (ed.), *Cartularium Monasterii de Ramseia*, 3 vols., Rolls Series, 1884–93. W. Greenwell (ed.), *Boldon Buke*, Surtees Society, vol. xxv, 1852, and *Bishop Hatfield's Survey*, *ibid.*, vol. xxvii, 1857. W. Hale (ed.), *The Domesday of St. Paul's*, Camden Soc., 1857. B. Lees (ed.), *Records of the Templars in England in the Twelfth Century*, 1935. L. B. Larking (ed.), *The Knights Hospitallers in England*, Camden Soc., 1857. *The Red Book of Worcester*, MS. Eccl. Com., 2/121/43698, partly printed in M. Hollings (ed.), *The Red Book of Worcester*, part I, Worc. Hist. Soc., 1934. *The Shaftesbury Cartulary*, B.M. MS. Harl. 61; I am much indebted to the generosity of Prof. Stenton, who lent me his own transcripts of the MS. *The Cartulary of the Abbey of the Trinity of Caen*, Bib. Nationale MS. Lat. 5650; a photostat of this has been procured, through the kind assistance of the Prof. M. Bloch and Prof. Eileen Power.

[2] On some of the Peterborough manors, however (e.g. Irthlingborough), we find labour services partly or wholly commuted in 1308. The commutation apparently took place earlier, but how much earlier we shall not be able to tell until we know something about the Peterborough estates in the second half of the twelfth century: *Peterborough Account Rolls* for 1292 and 1308. Photostats of the Accounts have been made available through the kind generosity of Mr. Mellows and Miss Wake of the Northamptonshire Record Society.

It is somewhat more difficult to understand the insufficient attention which has been paid to the evidence of the long-available twelfth-century surveys of the estates of the Ramsey Abbey (which are the very estates which Vinogradoff chose to cite as an example of the "immutable" manorial custom) and to those of the Bishop of Durham. On the Ramsey estates the manors not only contain large bodies of tenants described as *censuarii* and discharging the bulk of their obligations in money, but, what is still more important, they have undoubtedly been affected by a recent process of commutation. Not everywhere is the evidence as clear as on the manor of Holywell, about which we are told that in the time of King Henry I there were twenty-three virgates *omnes ad opus*, and *nunc autem quindecim tantum ex hiis operantur et cetere sunt ad censum*. But even where the changes have been less wholesale, as in Cranfield, or Shitlington and Pegsdon, they have all been in one direction—from labour services to rent.

More significant still is the evidence of the famous "Boldon Book" of the Bishopric of Durham. The fifty-five manors, for which this survey (c. 1183) gives sufficient information to justify a verdict, fall into three distinct groups. One of these is made up of some twenty manors organised on the pattern of the manor of Boldon, on which manorial institutions function with undiminished vigour. Villeinage with heavy labour services characterises their social structure and conditions of tenure, the demesne is either farmed out as a single unit or, as in at least eight manors, managed directly by the Bishop. Then there is an intermediate group of some eighteen manors, such as West Auckland or Stockton-on-Tees, on which the manorial organisation is not so complete, and the labour services are not so heavy, as on the manors of the Boldon type. But the real contrast is provided by a third group, consisting of nineteen odd manors, Newton-juxta-Boldon, South Bidick, Warden-Law, Morton, Trillesden, Mainsforth, Carlton, Darlington, Blackwell, Cockerton, Redworth, Lanchester, Ryton, Crawcrook, Winlaton, Westow, Bedlington, Whickham, and Haughton Parva. In none of these do we find villeins burdened with week-work, on some of them the very name of villein has disappeared and the bulk of the population consists of money-paying *molmen*, or more commonly *firmarii*.

On nearly all of the manors in the last group the money-paying tenants have arisen from what once upon a time was ordinary villeinage. The twelve molmen of Newton-juxta-Boldon are described in a fourteenth-century survey as erstwhile villeins, the eighteen bovates held by *firmarii* of Wardon are described as *terre bondorum* in the fourteenth century survey and so also are the lands of men who figure as *firmarii* in the 1183 survey of the manors of Morton and Carlton (Carleton). But the most significant indication of the change is to be found in what we can glean of the fate of the demesne. With the exception of Haughton Parva, the manors in this group do not contain any functioning demesnes, though they must have possessed them at some time. In Darlington, which is the only place where the holdings of the *firmarii* are differentiated from those of the other rent-paying tenants, the twelve bovates held by them in 1183 correspond exactly to the twelve bovates of the erstwhile demesne, as described in the later survey. More transparent still is the position on the Ryton group of manors. We are told in the 1183 document that the men of Ryton, Crawcrook, Winlaton and Westow hold their manors, demesnes and works at farm, while in the later survey each of the men is holding his customary tenement *cum parcellis dominicis* pertaining to it. The process is described best—for it has apparently taken place most recently—in the 1183 survey of the village of Whickham. The entry in the Boldon Book tells us that the "*dominium . . . erat tunc in manu episcopi, nunc autem predictum manerium est ad firmam cum dominico,*" and then, as in Ryton, we find the later survey showing the demesne held in parcels attached to the customary holdings.

One other familiar survey, the so-called Domesday of St. Paul's, though later in date, throws backward glances, which are numerous enough to give us an insight into twelfth-century conditions. What we learn does not differ much from what we have observed in the surveys already mentioned. Not only were rent paying tenants of every sort and description predominant at the time of the principal survey of 1222, but many of them had obtained their holdings and established a purely monetary connection with the landlord in the course of the preceding century. Some of them appeared as a result of assarting, which on the St. Paul's estates was continuous throughout the greater part of the Middle Ages. But in addition to holders of assarts, there are also numerous money-paying tenants, whose tenures bear witness to the transformation of either the land in villeinage, or the demesne, or both. In Kensworth the territory of the village is very largely made up of holdings of this kind. In Caddington nearly twenty virgates of demesne land are let out — 12 to rent-paying tenants and another 7½ to tenants owing labour services. Large portions of the demesne arable are also let out in Ardleigh, Sandon and Luffenhall, Beauchamp, and Heybridge.

Somewhat rarer are references to commutation of villein holdings and it would, indeed, be wrong to suppose that all the tenements *ad censum* need necessarily have arisen as a result of commutation. Yet occasional references show that some must have appeared in that way, and while there are also a few instances of money rents which have been turned into labour services only very recently (which, as we shall see further, was to be expected), there are in the manors of Kensworth, Ardleigh, Luffenhall, and Runwell clear traces of somewhat less recent changes in the direction of commutation.

That these changes must have taken place in the twelfth century is shown by a number of chronological indices. The evidence is clear in the case of the manor of Beauchamp in Essex, for which we possess a survey of 1181, revealing roughly the same proportion of land held for rent in the demesne, land let out and land asserted as we find in the survey of 1222. Elsewhere indirect evidence is provided by the names of men responsible for the innovation. In "Adulfsnasa," the men chiefly responsible for the letting of the demesne and of the "assessed" hide were Richard Rufus and Hugh de Runwell, who were active in the second half of the twelfth century, and Allard who probably administered the manor at the turn of the century. In Runwell the additions to the rent-paying holdings on the lands of the *antiquum tenementum*, the wholesale letting out of lands described as "East Strete" and the letting out of parcels of demesne elsewhere, are associated with the names of the same Richard Rufus and of Gilbert de Arches, another twelfth-century administrator. In Heybridge it is the predecessors of the 1222 farmer who are responsible for the letting of demesne land. In Ardleigh some of the demesne was let by Ralph de Diceto, who was active in the eighties of the twelfth century and Richard of Stapleford who, though alive in 1222, was no longer farming the estate at the time. In the list of tenants *ad censum* we are referred to the activties of Master Alberic and Nicholas the Archdeacon, both twelfth-century men. It would take too long to enumerate all the references of the same kind on the other estates of St. Paul's, but the evidence of Navestock (Knavestock) is perhaps worth singling out. On that manor the "new demesne" was largely let out by Richard Rufus and his successors, but the list of tenants also contains a large number of men holding portions of the "old demesne," which must have been let out even earlier.

The significance of these familiar documents would perhaps have been realised more fully, had the earlier writers been able to study them in conjunction with other surviving surveys of twelfth-century estates, some of which have only come to light or become easily available quite recently. Of these the most important are the surveys of the estates of the Templars, the Bishopric of Worcester, the nuns of Shaftesbury and the nuns of the Trinity at Caen. These in conjunction with several smaller and more fragmentary surveys [1] provide a great deal of new and important evidence supporting the impression made by the more familiar sources.

---

[1] E.g. the Survey of Binham in Douglas, *The Social Structure of Medieval East Anglia*, 1922, app. ii, no. 3; or the Survey of the Lands of the *Camerarius* of the Abbey of Abingdon; T. Stevenson (ed.), *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, Rolls Series, 1858, vol. ii, pp. 297 *seq.*

Some of this information merely adds supplementary instances of the same kind as those which have already been observed elsewhere. Thus the description of the estates of the Bishop of Worcester in the "Red Book" of Worcester shows the manors of the Bishopric in Worcestershire and adjoining counties in 1182 containing both typical tenures *ad opus*, and large bodies of peasant, i.e. non-military, tenures for money. Anything in the nature of an exact enumeration of these is made difficult by the ambiguous term of *geld* which the compilers employ to denote money payments. Yet those instances in which the word unmistakably describes money payments to landlords alone account for some 225 virgates, as compared with 255 which may or may not have been held for labour services.

As elsewhere, the bulk of money tenures on the Bishop's estate may well have been older than the survey, possibly older than the bishopric itself; but, as elsewhere, many of the rents were undoubtedly a result of recent commutation. In Hartlebury, a manor on which money-paying tenants are relatively more predominant than on almost any of the other possessions of the bishop, we are told that they *deberent esse operarii*, that is, should be, but are not. We are told the same about Wodmancote, a hamlet of Bishop's Cleeve. In Tredington most of the money virgates are described as men *que solent operare*. About Newton, the hamlet of Ripple, we are told that 8½ virgates, listed in the survey, *novissime tenentur pro gabulo*. In most of the manors we are also given some indication as to the dates at which the lettings for money occurred. They are those of the mid-century bishops, John, Alverd and Simon.

Different in character, though similar in implication, is the evidence of the Templars' Inquest of 1190. The immense landed properties of the Order were distributed all over the country, covered every possible variation of geographical and social background, and included, side by side with well-rounded and perfectly articulated manors, a miscellaneous collection of fragmentary estates forming part of no clearly recognisable manorial units. Moreover, unlike most of the monastic estates surveyed in the twelfth century, those of the Order were administered primarily with a view to the money revenue which they yielded, rather than to the direct sustenance which could be derived from them. Hence it would be natural to expect the Inquest to reveal a development of rent far more extensive than elsewhere. Indeed, so marked is this feature of the document, that Vinogradoff, who saw it in manuscript, was impressed by its similarity with the rentals of a much later age.[1] And with the exception of a few estates, chiefly those in Gloucestershire and Oxfordshire for which the evidence of the document is not clear, the Survey has very little beyond rents and very light services to record.

Needless to say, many of the rent-paying tenures on the Templars' manors, especially on their non-manorialised properties in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire, are part of the inherited social order and require no explanation. Yet something in the nature of commutation will be required to account for the almost entire absence of tenures for full labour services in the manorialised areas of Warwickshire and Essex, and a process of commutation is in fact indicated by a few traces of recent changes which the document contains.

Thus in the Warwickshire manor of Balsall we find, in addition to the main group of tenants who hold for rent and light occasional services, a group of tenants who pay a higher rent than the rest and therefore *quieti sunt de omnibus consuetudinibus ville.* On a large number of manors rent-paying tenements have been carved out of the demesne lands. In Newton we are told that *una duarum hidarum qui erant in dominico est assisa* at 5*s.* a virgate. In the Sherbourne group the demesnes of Newbold and Tysoe are let out, and so are portions of the demesne in Balsall and in most of the Essex manors.

---

[1] *Villeinage in England,* p. 207.

Yet it is not the evidence of the Worcester survey or of the Templars' Inquest that historians of Seebohm's or Maitland's age would have found most revealing. Of the documents which have recently become available by far the most important are two or three surveys describing their respective manors at several successive points in the twelfth century, and thus giving an image less static and consequently more significant than that which historians have been able to derive from the better known documents. A typical document of this kind is the Cartulary of the Abbey of the Trinity at Caen.[1] The English estates of the nunnery are described in three successive twelfth-century surveys. The first, which apparently belongs to the early years of Henry I, shows in the Gloucestershire manor of Minchinhampton, 26 virgates *ad opus* and 9 *ad censum*. The second, belonging to the early years of Henry II, enumerates in the same manor, 9 virgates *ad opus*, 11 wholly commuted, and 11 with the option of performing the work or paying rent. The third survey, made some twenty years later, shows all the virgates of this manor commuted for a money rent. The same thing apparently happened at the Abbey's manors of Avening, near Minchinhampton, Felstead in Essex, Tilshead in Wilts, and probably also at Horstead in Norfolk.

A view at two successive points of the century is also available for a number of Dorset and Wiltshire estates belonging to the nuns of Shaftesbury. The manuscript in the British Museum contains copies of two surveys, of which one has apparently been drawn up in the late twenties or early thirties, and the other in the seventies.[2] The comparison between the two is made somewhat difficult by changes in the areas of some of the manors and by numerous mistakes in the medieval copy. Yet there is little doubt that the forty or fifty years which elapsed between the two versions, witnessed a considerable extension of money rents. Thus in the manor of Iwerne Minster, at the time of the first survey, there were 55 odd tenements, of which some 35 virgates and 60 acres were held for full labour services and about two virgates were held for money combined with somewhat substantial autumn services. By the time of the second survey there were only nine virgates on full labour services, while the rest were held either for money only or for money and autumn services. The same process occurred in the interval between the surveys on the manors of Tisbury, Chiselborough, Fontmell and Handley (Sixpenny) and of all the Shaftesbury manors for which comparable evidence is available, the manor of Holt in Bradford-on-Avon, alone fails to provide clear evidence of the process.

---

[1] The dating of the manuscript will be discussed elsewhere. The dates adopted here are roughly those suggested by Miss T. Birdsall in her essay on the English manors of the Abbey in *Anniversary Essays in Medieval History by Students of C. H. Haskins* (Boston and New York, 1929), pp. 25–44.

[2] For the dating of the two texts I am indebted to Prof. Stenton.

The most eloquent sequence of surveys is probably that of the Burton Cartulary, though its evidence is perhaps too eloquent to be dismissed with a passing mention and must be reserved for special consideration at the end of this essay. But even without that evidence the conclusions should be clear. The twelfth-century surveys available at present deal with more than three hundred manors differing in almost everything in which it is possible for manors to differ—geographical environment, social background, density of settlement, methods of cultivation, type of land-ownership and system of management. Where the differences are so striking the similarity of local changes suggests a general transformation at work. The exact magnitude of the transformation cannot, and probably never will, be properly measured, for it would be wrong to assume that the bulk of the money-paying tenures enumerated in the surveys are of recent origin. But even if the magnitude of the change can be disputed, its direction cannot. To unprejudiced eyes every sign points to a movement towards the commutation of services and the dissolution of the demesne.[1]

III

If what the twelfth-century surveys demonstrate is true, and the period did in fact witness a general movement of commutation, does this not mean that the founders of economic history were right after all? Can we say that what now emerges is not fundamentally different from the old assumption of a slow and gradual commutation, which began almost as soon as the manor came into existence and continued as long as the manor functioned? Unfortunately this is exactly what we cannot say as a result of the foregoing discussion. A continuous and uninterrupted process is the one thing the available evidence does not exhibit, and the failure of the twelfth-century commutation to remain equally general and strong in the thirteenth, is one of its most conspicuous features.

On some estates it may indeed have continued into the beginning of the thirteenth century, as it did on a few of the St. Paul's manors. The Survey of the estates of St. Mary's Priory, Worcester, compiled in the first half of the thirteenth century, describes a number of manors on which services had been commuted and the demesne leased. At least some of them (e.g. Tibritton) must have undergone the change much earlier, but it is quite possible that the lettings under the "new assize" were very recent.[2] In the more backward parts of the country the movement may have gone on unchecked. Thus it is likely, though by no means certain, that the wholly commuted estates depicted in the fourteenth-century survey of the Bishopric of Durham stand in direct succession to the half-commuted estates of the twelfth century. But on almost all the other manors for which we possess thirteenth-century documents, and above all on manors situated in the more progressive parts of England, in the heart of the arable and populous south, south-east and south-west, what the evidence reveals is not only the absence of a general commutation, but the action of a diametrically opposite process. The period following the commutation of the twelfth century and preceding the return of commutation in the fourteenth, is one of stabilisation and even of increase in labour services.

---

[1] Vinogradoff could not help noticing that a process of commutation was at work on the estates of Glastonbury, St. Paul's and Burton: *Villeinage in England*, p. 307, 327, 330. He was however prevented from drawing the conclusion, which the texts suggest, by his general theories of the development of feudalism and the absence of money economy. More emphatic are the references to twelfth century commutations in Prof. Douglas's book: *op. cit.*, pp. 83, 123–9.

[2] W. Hale Hale (ed.), *Registrum Prioratus Beate Marie Wigorniensis*, Camden Soc., vol. xci, 1865.

In the agrarian history of England the thirteenth century is a period of *Hochkonjunktur*—an age of rising production, expanding settlement, technical improvements, the investment of capital, the application of a greater amount of labour to the same amount of land. It was accompanied by the growth of the demesne on the bulk of the estates for which we have evidence. Out of about eight hundred manors investigated, over six hundred and fifty show clear signs of an extension or intensification of demesne cultivation.[1] This growth of the demesne was unaccompanied by any considerable increase in the amount of land subject to villein labour. It was therefore bound to lead to a full exaction, or even an increase of the labour services borne by each unit of villein land.

The relevant facts have been known to historians for a long time; but, as most of them have been collected in the course of local studies, they have been commonly treated as local phenomena. Maitland noticed a tendency to increasing labour services on his Cambridgeshire manor, Miss Neilson pointed it out on the Ramsey estates, Mr. Feiling discovered it on an Essex manor of Battle Abbey, Professor Douglas on some of the estates of Ely. A depression of a different kind has been described in Mr. Bishop's study of the Cistercian granges in Yorkshire, while Professor Kosminsky and Professor Petrushevsky have drawn our attention to the general feudal reaction of the thirteenth century, and Vinogradoff found instances of it in the *Hundred Rolls*.[1] There is thus nothing in the so-called "manorial reaction" to surprise scholars who have studied rural conditions in detail, though it is only when the local evidence is brought together that the prevalence and the ubiquity of the reaction becomes evident.

---

[1] A list and an analysis of these will be included in the book on which the present paper is based.

The ubiquity of the process may sometimes escape attention, owing to the variety of ways in which the increased demand for labour services could be met, and additional burdens imposed. One of the ways was to subdivide units of villein tenure without decreasing the services attaching to them. This was one of the methods by which Glastonbury Abbey raised the amount of labour available on a number of its manors. The commonest way, however, was by the addition of new services, as on the estates of the Bishopric of Winchester, where we find new *precaria* introduced and enforced, or on the estates of Ramsey, for which Miss Neilson has tabulated the additions made to the customary services of the tenants during the century.[2]

A method equally common, though even more likely to escape the attention of students, was the "definition" of services, formerly left undefined. It is a common assumption that this earlier indefiniteness was against the peasant's interest. But, as a matter of fact, that was not always so. Frequently, the translation of the undefined week work into a definite task to be done in a day was and was meant to be a far heavier burden on the villein than an undefined day's work. By way of definition a number of new burdens were imposed on some of the estates of Ely between 1222 and 1277, on some of the estates of Peterborough before 1308 and on the estates of the Bishop of Worcester.[1]

---

[1] Maitland, "The History of a Cambridgeshire Manor," *Coll. Papers*, II, pp. 366 *seq.*; Neilson, *Economic Condition of the Manors of Ramsey Abbey*, 1898, pp. 26, 45–52; Feiling, "An Essex Manor in the Fourteenth Century," *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, 1911; Douglas, *op. cit.*, p. 112; Bishop, "Monastic Granges in Yorkshire," *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, 1935; Vinogradoff, *Villeinage in England*, p. 204; Kosminsky, *op. cit*, p. 206, *seq.*

[2] E.g. the fardellers of East Pennard and East Brent, half-virgaters of High Ham: Elton and others (ed.), *Rentualia et Custumaria . . . abbatum . . . Glastonie*, Somerset Rec. Soc., vol. v, 1891; B.M. MS. Vesp. F. xi. Hall, *Pipe Roll of the Bishop of Winchester*, 1209, and MS. Eccl. Com. 2/159447: (e.g. Brightwell and Taunton). Neilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 26, 45–52. Also Douglas, *op. cit*, app. ii, no. 3 and MS. B.M. Claud. D. xiii. fo. 7 *seq.*

The method, however, which most merits the term "reaction" was the abolition of earlier commutation and the imposition of full labour dues on tenants who used to hold for money rent. Instances of this which are easiest to trace are those of destroyed "options." The earlier surveys of estates frequently provide the tenants with an option of either paying their rent in money or performing services. The choice was in most cases the lord's, but whenever the lord chose to take money the full labour services were *eo ipso* foregone. In the thirteenth century however we find survey after survey destroying the option and both imposing a rent, as if the tenure were *ad censum*, and exacting labour services far heavier than those which had accompanied rent tenures in the past—commonly the full labour services. This indeed was the method adopted in the thirteenth century by Glastonbury, and a number of smaller estates.[2]

Most significant of all, however, are instances of reaction in the narrowest sense of the word—the simple revocation of the earlier concessions and a return to the heavier terms of the dim and distant past. By a lucky accident, one of our documents has preserved obvious signs of some such reaction in preparation. The twelfth-century survey of Glastonbury bears on its margins notes in what appears to be a somewhat later hand, suggesting alterations in the conditions of tenure recorded in the text. In almost every case the note is against entries of parcels of demesne let out or of services commuted, and in almost every case the comment on the former is that they had better be drawn back into demesne (*utilius esset in dominicum*) and on the latter that they had better be let again for work (*utilius esset ad opus*).[1] And even a cursory reading of Abbot Michael of Amesbury's survey in the thirties of the following century will show how closely the spirit of the instructions was followed, though it was left to the compilers of the survey of Abbot Roger Ford, a generation later, to record a yet further increase in the needs of the demesne and a yet further augmentation of services.[2]

---

[1] Hollings, *op. cit.*; MS. Eccl. Com. 2/121/43698.

[2] Documents cited *above*, p. 27, footnote 1: (e.g. Mere, Winterbourne, Bradbury). Maxwell-Lyte, *op. cit.*: (e.g. Stoke-under-Hamden).

IV

Thus the typical sequence is from labour services to partial or complete commutation, and then back again to partial or complete return of labour services. To say that this sequence was typical is also to insist on the fact that it was not universal. We have noted complete estates, such as those of Peterborough, or individual manors in other estates, which were not affected by the twelfth-century commutation; there were also estates, such as those of Durham, which may not have been affected by the reaction of the thirteenth century. Moreover, a number of manors which were not subject to the action of the early commutation, were nevertheless visited by the later urge to expansion and saw their labour services intensified. Above all special circumstances could produce local deviations. Professor Stenton has noted the creation of demesnes on some of the Lincolnshire sokes in the twelfth century. At Wargrave, one of the manors of the Bishopric of Winchester, services were commuted in the year 1252, when the bulk of the other Winchester estates were imposing them. At St. Ives, a Ramsey manor the proportion of holdings for labour service was falling in the thirteenth century, at the very time when the Abbey was imposing new labour dues on the bulk of its estate.[1] For the two latter manors the explanation is obvious; St. Ives was a market town, Wargrave was engaged in a piece of large-scale colonisation. But for the Lincolnshire case an explanation will be difficult to find, and a diligent search would doubtless reveal others equally difficult to explain. In short, exceptions there were, and it would be strange if there had been none, but numerous as they may be they do not obscure the general trend, which no statistical test, however simple, will fail to exhibit. Nor do they overshadow the typical instances of manors, or whole estates, going through the entire sequence of alternating stability and dissolution.

---

[1] Jackson (ed.), *op. cit.*

[2] *Supra*, p. 187, footnote 2.

It is because the estates of Burton Priory in Staffordshire and Derbyshire provide one such typical instance that a consideration of them has been deferred until now. The earliest condition of the estates is portrayed in the first of the twelfth-century surveys of the manors of Bromley, Stretton and Burton, belonging, probably, to the first quarter of the century. In this survey we find the core of the village consisting of tenants subject to full labour dues and described as villeins. The second description of these estates, the date of which is a generation or two later, shows the demesne let out, mostly to the former villeins, and the latter turned *censuarii*. But a third, a thirteenth-century reference, is concerned with litigation between the Prior and his tenants, the tenants complaining to the royal courts that the landlord is treating them as villeins and not as *censuarii*, and is demanding from them villein service. The cycle is thus complete, though it is destined to be broken again in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when a new, and this time a final, wave of commutation lays for ever the ghost of manorial order on the lands of the Prior of Burton.[1]

---

[1] Stenton, *Danelaw Charters*, p. cviii; *idem*, *Types of Manorial Structure, etc.*, p. 26. For Wargrave, see Eccl. Com. 2/159447. For St. Ives, see the Ramsey Surveys referred to above.

In this Burton example the social relations implied in the reaction, are as characteristic as the reaction itself. In many instances the re-imposition of the old labour services or the addition of new ones, was brought about by something resembling a bargain and was accompanied by compensating concessions to the tenants. It has been tacitly assumed in this essay that rents and labour services stood in a complementary relation to each other, and that an increase in one would, in normal circumstances, be accompanied by a decrease in the other. This was certainly so whenever labour services were remitted, and it was occasionally so in cases when labour services were re-imposed. A very illuminating illustration of this is provided by the manorial accounts of the Crowland manors.[2] When, in the second half of the thirteenth century, the landlords required additional labour from their customary tenants, the accounts contain allowances of rent in compensation for the extra labour performed. The arrangement continues for years, until at last, at the beginning of the fourteenth century, the additional services are merged into the customary ones and the rent is permanently lowered. A similar procedure was adopted on the manor of Brightwell in Hampshire, belonging to the Bishop of Winchester. There are traces of similar transactions on some of Hospitallers' manors in Oxfordshire, which had formerly belonged to the Templars, and on some of the Battle Abbey manors.[1]

---

[1] Wrottesley (ed.), *The Burton Cartulary*, Wm. Salt Soc., pp. 20 and 26 (Bromley), 22 and 28, 19 and 25 (Stratton, Mickle Over and Little Over) ; *idem*, *Staffordshire Plea Rolls*, Wm. Salt. Soc., vol. vi, part 1, pp. 60, 98, 109 and 116 ; for the dating of the Survey, see Round, *Burton Abbey Surveys*, vol. ix, N.S., pp. 272–6. Round was unnecessarily puzzled by the differences in the amounts of farm in the two surveys.

[2] Page, *op. cit.* Cf. the rents on p. 284 with the table of services on p. 84, and the accounts of Cottenham and Oakington and Drayton, pp. 21 *seq.*, 233 *seq.*, 176–9. Also *idem.*, *Wellingborough Manorial Accounts*, Northampton Rec. Soc., vol. viii, p. xxvi and text.

Very often, however, the procedure was simpler, shorter and more like that of Burton. The lords imposed additional services without a *quid pro quo* of any kind, cancelled earlier commutations, reduced their tenants to simple villeinage, refused to recognise customary contracts. Thirteenth-century instances of complaints brought by tenants before the royal courts are frequent enough, but they are much less frequent than the cases of oppression which must actually have taken place, since the only ground on which royal interference could be claimed was the plea that the manor was on ancient demesne, and the estates on which the peasants had any reason at all to believe themselves to be on what was once King's land must have been very few. As in the very similar movement of the German *Bauernlegen* three hundred years later, the will of the lord prevailed.

The parallel with the East German *Bauernlegen* applies also to what is the most important feature of the process, as well as the most important omission in this paper. Nothing has so far been said here of the causes of the movements, of forces responsible for the expansion of the demesne, and for the rise and fall of services. The object of this essay has been to indicate the main chronological landmarks and only incidentally to question the assumption of a continuous evolution towards free tenure. If, as a mere by-product, a doubt has emerged as to the effects of the so called rise of money economy, we shall do nothing here to remove it. For it is a salutary doubt. The rise of money economy has not always been the great emancipating force which nineteenth-century historians believed it to have been. In the absence of a large reservoir of free landless labour and without the legal and political safeguards of the liberal state, the expansion of markets and the growth of production is as likely to lead to the increase of labour services as to their decline. Hence the paradox of their increase in Eastern Germany, at the time when the production of grain for foreign markets was expanding most rapidly, and hence also the paradox of their increase in England, too, at the time and in the places of the highest development of agricultural production for the market during the Middle Ages.

---

[1] Cf. the terms of virgate tenures in Merton in the twelfth century Templars' Inquest with those recorded in the Hundred Rolls. Also Scargill-Bird, *The Estates of Battle Abbey*, pp. 58–82 (Bromeham and Bright Walton).

INDEX

Aachen. *See* Aix-la-Chapelle.
Abergavenny, Lord. *See* Nevill, George.
Adam de Orlton, bishop of Winchester, 151.
Adeline, d. of William de Warenne, 112.
Admiralty, the, 51–4, 58.
" Adulfsnasa," manor of (Essex), 179.
Aix-la-Chapelle, 14, 81.
Alan, Count of Brittany, 117–20, 122.
Alberic, master, 180.
Albini (Brito), William de, Lord of Belvoir, 118–20.
Albini (Pincerna), William de, Earl of Sussex, 112–13.
Alexander, bishop of Lincoln, 119–20, 130.
Allard, 180.
Alneto, William de, 132.
Alverd (Alfred), bishop of Worcester, 181.
American Colonies, the, 89.
American Revolution, War of the (1776–83), 53.
Amesbury, Michael, Abbot of, 189.
Angevin party, the, 109, 115, 121, 123–4, 126, 128, 170.
Anglia Sacra, 136.
Anglo-American Conferences, 3, 10.
Anjou, Count of. *See* Geoffrey.
Anne, Queen of England, 46 *n.*, 51, 57–8.
Antigua (W. Indies), 34, 50, 56, 58 *n.*
Antwerp, 152.
Aquitaine, 151. Duke of, *see* Edward III.
Arches, Gilbert de, 180.
Ardleigh (Herts), 179–80.
Aristotle, 158.
Ashby-de-la-Zouch (Leics), 132.
Atkinson, Richard, 90–2, 94–6, 98.
Atkinson, Rum, 98.
Atterbury, Francis, bishop of Rochester, 61–2, 66–70, 73–81.
Atterbury, Mrs., 68.
Atton, John of, 161, 165.
Auckland (co. Durham), 155.
Aungerville, Thomas de, canon of Wells, 137, 149.
Austria, relations between England and, 15–16, 20, 22, 25–6, 30, France and, 21, 26, Germany and, 26–7, Italy and, 15, 26, Prussia and, 20–1, 23–6, 30, Russia and, 26.
Austro-Prussian War, the (1866), 30.
Avening, manor of (Glos.), 183.
Avignon, 144, 147–50, 164.
Avranches, Turgis of, 125.
Ayremynne William de, bishop of Norwich, 151, 164.

Baber, Edward, 88.
Bacon, Roger, 157.
Bahamas, the, 47.
Balliol College, Oxford, 162.
Balsall (Warwickshire), 182–3.
Bamborough (Northumberland), 111.
Barbados (W. Indies), 32 *n.*, 35, 41 *n.*, 48–50, 52, 53 *n.*, 55 *n.*, 56.
Baring, Sir Francis, 95.
Barnes, Mrs., 68.
Barwell, Mr., 98.
Basset, Robert, 119.
Bateman, William, 164.
Battle Abbey (Essex), 186, 192.
Battles. *See* Lincoln, Standard.
Bauernlegen, 192.
Beauchamp, manor of (Essex), 179.
Beaufort, Duke of. *See* Somerset, Henry.
Beaumont, Hugh de, lord of Bedford, 112.
Beaumont, Louis de, bishop of Durham, 149–50.
Beaumont family, the, 107.
Beaumont, Robert de, Earl of Leicester, 112.
Beaumont, Waleran de, Earl of Worcester, 112
Bedford, 126.
Bedlington, manor of (Durham), 177.

Bek, Anthony, 164.
Belgium, relations between France and, 30.
Bellot, Professor H. Hale, 8–9.
Belvoir castle (Notts.), 119; priory, 119, 133.
Benedict XII, Pope, 153.
Benfield, Paul, 98.
Bengal, 97.
Bentinck, Sir Henry, 22–4.
Berkshire, 176.
Berlin, 14, 17–21, 23, 26, 29.
Bermondsey Priory, London, 161.
Bernstorff, Count, 28–9.
Bigod, Hugh, 123, 125.
Bisaccia, bishop, *see* Richard.
Bishop, T. A. M., *Monastic Granges in Yorkshire*, 187.
Bishop's Cleeve (Glos.), 181.
Bismarck, Otto von, Prince, and Austria, 18, 23, 30; and England, 13–30; and Lord Clarendon, 17, 19, 25; and Palmerston, 29; and Queen Victoria, 13–15, 29; and Russia, 18, 26, 28; and the Diet at Frankfurt, 15, 18, 21–4; and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, 17, 29; and the North German Confederation, 31; and William I, King of Prussia, 28–9; appointment as Ambassador to France of, 29; estimate of, 28; influence at the Prussian Court of, 17, 20, 22; relations between Lord Bloomfield and, 17–19, 21–5, 27–8, between Manteuffel and, 16–19, 21–4, between Napoleon III and, 29–30, between Sir Alexander Malet and, 15–17, 19–26.
Blackwell, manor of (Durham), 177.
Blois, Abbot Henry of, 176.
Bloomfield, John Arthur, Lord, 17–19, 21–8.
Board of Trade, the, 52.
Boldon (Durham), 177.
"Boldon Book," 177–8.
Bolingbroke, honour of, 106, 113.
Bologna (Italy), 143.
Bombay, 84, 100.
Bordeaux, 35, 138, 144.
Boston (U.S.A.), 46, 49, 55.
Bourgeois, Émile, 3.
Bradwardine, Thomas, 160–1, 165.
Brayton, Thomas de, 142.
Bridlington, 122.
Brightwell, manor of (Hants), 191.
Bristol, 46.
British Academy (London), 3.
British Museum (London), 3, 183.
British National Committee of Historical Sciences, 4–5, 10.
British Records Association, 4, 5, 8; Records Preservation Section of the, 5.
Brittany, count of, *see* Alan.
Bromborough, manor of (Cheshire), 134.
Bromley, manor of (Staffs), 190.
Browne, Anthony Joseph, Lord Montagu, 91.
Bruce, Robert, 154–5.
Brussels, 74, 152.
Buckinghamshire, 173.
Burgclere, Winifred, Lady, 2.
Burke, Edmund, 84–6, 91–2, 96–8.
Burley, Walter, 149, 157, 161, 163.
Burton (Staffs), cartulary, 184; manor of, 190, 192; prior of, 191; priory, 190.
Burwash, Henry, bishop of Lincoln, 149.
Bury, John de, 151.
Bury de Richard, *see* Richard.
Bury St. Edmunds, 140.
Business Archives, Council for the Preservation of, 4.
Bynteworth, Richard de, 151, 161, 164–5.
Byron, George Noel Gordon, Lord, 13.

CADDINGTON (Herts), 179.
Caen, Normandy, 180.
Calcutta presidency, 84.
Calke, prior of, 134.
Call, Mr., 98.
Cambrésis, bishop of, 153.
Cambridge, 4; earldom of, 113, 119; university of, 148, 162.
Cambridgeshire, 172, 186.
Camelford (Cornwall), 98.
Canterbury, 121; archbishops of, *see* Robert de Winchelsea; Stratford, John; and William.
Carlisle, 110–11, 129; earl of, *see* Howard, Frederick; honour of, 105.
Carlton (Carleton), manor of (Durham), 177–8.
Carlyle, Thomas, 14.
Carteret, John, Lord, 66–8.
Cator, John, 98.
Cecil, Robert Arthur Talbot Gascoigne, Earl of Salisbury, 14.
Chamberlain, Joseph, 14.
Chambre, William de, 135–7, 139, 144, 149–51, 154, 159–60, 165.

Charles, Prince, the young Pretender, 76.

Charley (Leics), 131, 133.

Chatham, Earl of. *See* Pitt, William, 93.

Chertsey Abbey (Surrey), 149.

Cheshire, 139.

Chester, 127–8, 134, 138–9; abbey, 130, 134; bishop of, *see* Durdent, Walter; countess of, *see* Matilda; earls of, *see* Edward III, Ranulf de Gernons; honour of, 166; Ranulf Vicomte de Bayuex and D'Avranches Richard.

Chichester, 146.

Chiselborough (Chislebury), (Som.), 184.

Chitty, Mr., 37.

Churchill, Colonel, 66–9.

Churchill, John, Duke of Marlborough, 66.

Clarendon, Lord, 17, 19, 21, 24–5. *See* Villiers, George William Frederick.

Clarke, Maude V., 2.

Clement V, Pope, 157.

Clementina, Princess Maria, wife of James, the Old Pretender, 74.

Clerfai, William, 120.

Clinton, Geoffrey de, 106.

Clito, William, 107.

Clive, Robert, Lord, 83, 97.

Close Roll, 139, 141.

Cockerton, manor of (Durham), 177.

Coke, William, *Memoirs of Sir Robert Walpole*, 70.

Cologne, 152.

Complete Peerage, the, 4.

Coote, Eyre, 90 *n.*

Cork, 34.

Cornwall, 117.

Cory, Sir George, 2.

Cotes, Admiral, 39.

Cottenham (Cambs), 172.

Cottenham, Gilbert of, 172.

Coventry, 122, 127–8, 132, 138. Bishop of, *see* Roger de Northburgh.

Coville, Monsieur, 10.

Cranfield (Beds), 177.

Crawcrook, manor of (Durham), 177–8.

Crawford, Mr., 66.

Crediton (Devon), 146.

Cremona (Italy), 143.

Crimean War, the, 16, 20, 22, 25, 30.

Crowland (Lincs), abbot of, 172; manor of, 191.

Croyndon (Devon), 146.

Crump, Charles George, 145.

Curaçao (Leeward Islands), 45.

Cursus Curie Romane, 141, 158.

Dallas, Robert, 86.

Danegeld, the, 130.

Dante, 158.

Darell, Lionel, 98.

Darlington, manor of (Durham), 177–8.

Daungerville, Roger, 152.

d'Avranches, Richard, Earl of Chester, 105, 107.

Davers, Admiral, 32 *n.*, 44–5, 50, 53–4.

David, King of Scots, 110–11, 128–9, 133.

Derby, Earl of, *see* Robert.

Derbyshire, 106, 190.

Devaynes, William, 94.

Devizes (Wilts), 133.

Diceto, Ralph de, 180.

Dillon, Arthur, General, 64, 69–70, 73, 74, 77, 80–1.

Disraeli, Benjamin, 16.

Domesday of St. Paul's, 178–9.

Donnington Castle (Notts), 132.

Dorset, 176, 183.

Doughty, Sir Arthur C., 2.

Douglas, Sir James, Commodore, 33 *n.*

Douglas, D. C., 186.

Dowdall, the (ship), 32 *n.*

Dubois, Guillaume, Cardinal, 66, 73.

Dudley, Joseph, 46 *n.*

Dugdale, Sir William, 105, 134.

Dunbar, Earl of. *See* Murray, James.

Dundas, Henry, 85, 91.

Durdent, Walter, bishop of Chester, 134.

Durham, 142, 146, 149, 155, 189; bishopric of, 186; bishops of, *see* Beaumont, Louis de; Bury, Richard de, and Pudsey, Hugh; chronicle, 135–6; treaty of (1139), 111.

East India Company, the, and the chartered companies, 91; and the parliamentary election of 1784, 95–8; Burke's Bill, 85–6; comparison between Fox's and Pitt's India Bills, 100–1; East India Charter, 86, 88; Fox's

India Bills (1783), 85–94, 99–101 ; Pitt's India Act (1784), 83, 94–5, 99–101 ; Regulating Act (1773), 83–4 ; relations between the British government and, 83–101 ; select and secret committees, 83, 85.
East Indians in 1784, 98.
Eastern Question, the, 16.
Eastham, manor of (Cheshire), 134.
Edward III, King of England, 138–40, 142, 144–50, 152–3, 155–7, 159, 163.
Edwardes, Mr., 23, 25.
Elizabeth, Queen of England, 136.
Elliot, Sir Gilbert, 87.
Ely (Cambs), 186–7.
Ely, bishop of, *see* Nigel.
Emperors. *See* Frederick II and Otto.
Empress, the. *See* Matilda.
England and the India question (1783–4), 83, 101 ; and the Jacobites, 69, 72–3 ; and the loss of the American colonies, 89 ; and the Union with Scotland, 72–3 ; chronology of labour services in, 169–193 ; comparison between labour service in East Germany and, 92–3 ; expedition of Henry Plantagenet to, 128 ; parliamentary election of 1784 in, 95–8 ; relations between Austria and, 15–16, 20, 22, 25–6, 30, Bismarck and, 13–30, France and, 16, 29–30, Italy and, 15, Prussia and, 14–30, Russia and, 16, 27, Scotland and, 110–11, Wales and, 111.
England, Kings of. *See* Edward III, George II, George III, Henry I, Henry II, Stephen and William III.
England, Queens of. *See* Anne, Elizabeth, Isabella, Maud, Philippa and Victoria.
English Channel, the, 43.
Erskine, John, Duke of Mar, arrest of, 63–4 ; death of, 81–2 ; documentary evidence re, 61–2, 65, 70, 78–9 ; estimate of, 61, 81–2 ; fall of, 75, 78, 81 ; flight of, 62 ; his " Legacies," 62, 70, 73 ; intrigues against, 74–8 ; negotiations between France and, 72–4, between Lord Stair and, 63, between Russia and, 63, between Sweden and, 63, between the British government and, 63–5, 70 ; part played in Jacobite affairs by, 61–8, 70–80 ; pension, 65, 74, 76, 78 ; private life of, 70 ; political projects of, 64, 70–4 ; poverty of, 65–6 ; relations between Bishop Atterbury and, 62, 66–70, 75, 78–81, between Colonel Hay and, 74–7, between James Murray and, 76–7, between the Old Pretender and, 62–5, 68–80 ; release of, 64 ; " Secretary of State," 62 ; supposed treachery of, 63, 65–71.
Erskine, Thomas, Lord, 64.
Essex, 182–3.
Eugenius III, Pope, 133.
Eustace, son of King Stephen, 133.
Evans, Sir Vincent, 2.
Exeter, 146–71 ; castle, 115.

Faba, Guido, 143.
Feiling, Keith, 186.
Felstead, manor of (Essex), 183.
Firth, Sir Charles, 2.
Fitz Gerald de Roumare, Roger, 105.
Fitz Gilbert, Baldwin, 108.
Fitz Hamme, manor of (Bucks), 173.
Fitz John, Eustace, 128.
Fitzmaurice, Edmond, Lord, 2.
Fitz Ralph, Thomas, 165.
Fitz Richard of Cornwall, William, 115.
Fitzwilliam, Lord. *See* Wentworth-Fitzwilliam, William.
Flanders, 152, 161.
Fletcher, Sir Henry, 86, 91, 93.
Fontmell (Dorset), 184.
Ford, Roger, Abbot, 189.
Fortescue, Sir John, 2.
Foster, C. W., 2.
Fotheringham, J. K., 2.
Fox, Charles James, 84–91, 93–6, 98–101.
Fox-North coalition, 83, 88.
France, and the manning of the Navy in the West Indies (18th c.), 31, 33, 35, 46, 48, 58 ; english expedition to (1331), 138, 147–8, 152 ; mission of Richard de Bury to, 144, 147–52 ; relations between Austria and, 21, 26, Belgium and, 30, England and, 16, 29–30, Germany and, 15, 27, Italy and, 26, Prussia and, 20–2, 25, 28–30, Russia and, 16, 26.

France, Kings of. *See* Louis XV and Philip VI.
Francis, Philip, 84–5, 95.
Franco-Austrian War (1857), 23–4.
Franco-German War, the (1870–1), 15, 30.
Frankfurt, 15–16, 19–20, 22–4; Diet at, 15, 18, 21–4.
Frankland, Thomas, Admiral, 32 *n.*, 33 *n.*
Frederick II, Emperor, 143.
Frederick William IV, King of Prussia, 23–4.

GAINSBOROUGH CASTLE (Lincs), 121.
"Galclirt." *See* Gaultney Wood.
Ganges, the (river), 89.
Gant, Gilbert de, 122.
Gascon Roll, 140–2.
Gascony, 140, 144.
Gaultney Wood, castle of (Northants) 118–20.
Geneva, 63, 76.
Geoffrey, Count of Anjou, 123, 126.
George II, King of England, 38.
George III, King of England, 83, 88, 90–1, 93, 100.
Germany, comparison between labour services of England and East, 192–3, relations between Austria and, 26–7, France and, 15, 27, Prussia and, 17–18, Russia and, 15–16, 18.
Gernons, Ranulf de. *See* Ranulf.
Gesta Stephani, 116, 118, 124–8.
Ghellinck, Father, 135, 159–60.
Givry, Monsieur, 48.
Gladstone, William, 14.
Glastonbury Abbey, Wells (Som.), 176, 187–8.
Gloucester, Earl of. *See* Robert.
Gloucestershire, 130, 182.
Glover, John Hulbert, 61.
Goldsmith, Oliver, "*Vicar of Wakefield*," 13.
Gortschakoff, Prince, 27.
Goschen, George Joachim, Lord, 13.
Gotham (Notts), 132.
Göttingen, 14.
Gower, Lord. *See* Leveson-Gower Granville.
Grandison, Otho de, 155.
Granville, George, Lord Lansdowne, 65, 68, 70, 81.
Gratian, 158.
Graystanes, Robert de, 149.
Gregory, Robert, 86.
Grenville, George, 37–8, 40.
Grenville, George, Nugent-Temple, Lord Temple, 85, 87, 91.
Gresley Castle (Derbyshire), 134.
Grimsby, abbot of, 134.
Grittleton (Wilts), 176.
Guernsey, 97.
Guy, John Hudson, 32 *n.*

HALL, Hubert, 9.
Handley (Sixpenny), (Dorset), 184.
Hannay, Sir Samuel, 98.
Hanway, Jonas, 42.
Hardinge, Henry, Lord, 86.
Hardy, Sir Thomas D., 141, 143.
Harlech, Lord. *See* Ormsby-Gore, George Ralph Charles.
Harris, James Howard, Earl of Malmesbury, 27.
Hartlebury (Worcs), 181.
Hartshill (Warwickshire), 132.
Hastings, Warren, 83–5, 93, 98, 101.
Haughton Parva, manor of (Durham), 177–8.
Hay, Colonel John (later Earl of Inverness), 74–7, 79.
Headlam, Cecil, 2.
Henry I, King of England, 105–8, 110, 177, 183.
Henry II, King of England, 183.
Henry of Northumberland, 129.
Henry Plantagenet, 128–9, 133–4.
Henry of Scotland, 110–12.
Hereford, 112.
Hertfordshire, 173.
Hexham, John of, 118, 120, 122.
Hexham, Richard of, 111.
Heybridge (Essex), 179–80.
Hinckley (Leics), 132.
Historical Association, 3, 6.
Historical Manuscripts Commission, 61.
Hoghton (Northumberland), 161.
Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, Leopold von, Prince, 30.
Holburne, Captain, 35.
Holcot, Robert, 159, 161, 165.
Holywell, manor of (Hunts), 177.
Holmes, T. Rice, 2.
Holt, manor of (Bradford-on-Avon, Wilts), 184.
Horstead (Norfolk), 183.
Hospitallers, the, 191.
Hotham, Richard, 97.
House of Lords, 46.
Howard, Frederick, Earl of Carlisle, 88.
Hundred Rolls, 170, 172, 187.
Huntingdon, Henry of, 108, 114, 124, *Epistola de Contemptu Mundi*, 120.

INDEMNITY, Act of (1717), 63–4.
India, relations between the British government and British (1783–4), 83–101.
India Bills (Fox's), (1783), 85–91, 94, 99–101; (Pitts), (1784), 83, 87, 99–101.
India House, London, 89–90, 92.
Institute of Historical Research, London, 3–6; Bulletin of the, 4–5.
Insula, Robert de, 172.
International Bibliography, 6.
International Committee of Historical Sciences, Bulletin of the, 6.
International Historical Committee, 10.
International Historical Congress, 6.
Inverness, Earl of. *See* Hay, John, Colonel.
Ireland, 147.
Isabella, Queen of England, 144–7.
Italy, and James, the Old Pretender, 63, relations between Austria and, 15, 26, England and, 15, France and, 26.
Ivo, constable of Coventry, 128.
Iwerne Minster (Dorset), 184.

JACOBITES, the, 61–82.
Jamaica, 32 *n.*, 34, 42–6, 49, 53–4, 58; Council of, 56–7.
James, the Old Pretender, 62–5, 67, 69–81.
Jenkin's Ear, War of (1739), 44.
Jenkinson, Charles, 90.
Jews, the, 107.
John, bishop of Worcester, 181.
John XXII, Pope, 141, 147, 149–53, 155.
Johnstone, George, 91.

KELLY, George, 68–9.
Kensworth (Beds), 179.
Kent, 130.
Kettering, 118, 175.
Kilvington, Richard de, 161, 165.
King of France. *See* Philip VI.
Kingston, Duke of. *See* Pierrepoint, Evelyn.
Kinoulton (Notts), 133.
Kirton-in-Lindsey, manor of (Lincs), 121.
Kitchen, George William, dean of Durham, 146.
Knavestock, manor of (Essex), 180.
Knowles, Charles, Commodore, 40, 47–50, 54–5, 57.
Kosminsky, Professor E. A., 172, 187.

LABOUR SERVICES in England, characteristics of 13th-c. agrarian history, 186–7; comparison between the East German *Bauernlegen* and, 192–3; difficulty in ascertaining the chronology of, 169–71; evidence of 12th-c. manorial surveys, 174–85, 188–90; of 13th-c. surveys, 185–92; reasons for the fluctuations of, 171–4.
Lanark, Adam, 145 *n.*
Lancaster, honour of, 111, 125, 129; records of the duchy of, 129.
Lanchester, manor of (Durham), 177.
Langton, Walter, bishop of Lichfield, 137–8.
Lansdowne, Lord. *See* Granville, George, 65, 68, 70, 81.
Laporte-Lalanne, Jean-Baptiste, 46 *n.*
Larnage, Marquis de, 32 *n.*
Lascelles, Henry, 38 *n.*, 41 *n.*, 51 *n.*, 60 *n.*
La Touche-Tréville, Captain, 48.
Lecky, William Edward Hartpole, 14.
Lee, Commodore, 54.
Leeward Islands, the, 35, 40 *n.*, 50, 54, 58.
Leicester, 130–3; forest of, 131; earl of, *see* Beaumont, Robert de.
Leicester Abbey Catalogue, 156.
Leicester Square, London, 91.
Leicestershire, 106, 119, 130, 132–3.
Leicht, Professor, 10.
Le Meschin. *See* Ranulf II, Vicomte de Bayeux.
Le Mesurier, Paul, 96–7.
Leveson-Gower, Granville, Lord Gower, 93.
Lewisham, Viscount, 87.
Liber Epistolaris, 135, 137–8, 140–1, 156.
Liber Niger Petroburgensis, 175, 176.
Lichfield, 137; bishop of, *see* Langton, Walter.
Lincoln, 105, 107, 110, 113, 115–17, 120, 122, 125, 127–8, battle of, 108, 114, 118, 120–1, 126; bishops of, *see* Alexander; Burwash, Henry, and Robert; castle of, 105–6, 113–18, 124, 127; church of, 130; earl of, *see* Roumare, William de.
Lincoln's Inn, London, 5.
Lincolnshire, 105–6, 113, 119, 129–30, 175, 182, 189–90.

Lisle, William, Captain, 50.
Little, Dr. A. G., 157.
Lockhart, George, 78, 81.
Lockhart Papers, 76.
Lodge, Sir Richard, 2, 6.
Lodge, Eleanor, 2.
Loftus, Lord, *see* Spencer, Augustus William Frederick, 29.
London, 8, 16, 19–20, 28–9, 53, 67, 91, 113, 115, 123, 146, 165.
Loro, Peter de, *Arenge*, 143–4.
Loughborough, Lord. *See* Wedderburn, Alexander.
Louis XV, King of France, 73.
Lucy, Countess, 104–6.
Lucy, Richard de, 134.
Luffenhall (Herts), 179.
Lushington, Stephen, 87, 93.
Luxemburg, 30.

MACAULAY, Thomas Babington, 14.
Macpherson, Mr., 98.
Madox, Thomas, 2.
Madras, 84, 100.
Mainsforth, manor of (Durham), 177.
Maitland, Frederick William, 183, 186.
Malet, Sir Alexander, 15–17, 19–26.
Malet, William, 104 *n*.
Malmesbury, Earl of. *See* Harris, James Howard.
Malmesbury, William of, 109, 114–15, 122.
Mandeville, Geoffrey de, 121, 123–5, 127.
Mandeville, Stephen de, 125.
Manning, Edward, 44, 53.
Manorial Economy (or Manors), *see* Labour Services.
Mansfield, Lord Chief Justice, 85.
Manteuffel, Freiherr O. von, 16–19, 21–4.
Mantua, 143.
Mar, Duke of. *See* Erskine, John
Marlborough, Duke of. *See* Churchill, John.
Marmion, Robert, 122.
Martinique, 33, 48, 58.
Massachusetts, 41.
Mathew, Governor, 50.
Matilda, Countess of Chester, 109.
Matilda, the Empress, 109, 115, 121, 123, 125, 128.
Matthew of Westminster, 105.
Maud, Queen of England, 108, 111.
Maudit, John, 165.
Maxwell, George, 38 *n*., 60 *n*.
Merton College, Oxford, 151, 160.
Michael of Amesbury, Abbot, 189.
Midlands, the, 107, 112, 120, 127, 129, 133.
Milan, 143.
Miles, Henry, 145 *n*.
Milne, A. T., 9.
Minchinhampton (Glos), 183.
Minting Priory (Lincs), 109, 134.
Mitchell, Cornelius, Captain, 43, 56.
Monckton, Edward, 97.
Montagu, Lord. *See* Browne, Anthony Joseph.
Montagu, Hon. Frederick, 86.
Montague, F. C., 2.
Montalt, Robert of, 127.
Moore, Sir John, Commodore, 56.
Morris, J. E., 2.
Mortimer, Roger, 145, 147.
Morton, manor of (Durham), 177–8.
Motley, John Lothrop, 14.
Mountsorrel (Leics), 131–3.
Munro, D. C., 2.
Murdac, Henry, archbishop of York, 133.
Murimuth, Adam, 150, 155, 160, 162–3.
Murray, James, Earl of Dunbar, 63–4, 76–7, 80.

NANTWICH, 127.
Napoleon III, Emperor, 29–30.
Navy in the West Indies, the (18th c.), attitude of N. America to the use of the pressgang in manning, 43–6; difficulties of manning, 31–60; effect of privateering on the manning of, 33, 36–7, 47–51; hardships of the seamen, 38–40; legislation which affected the manning of, 35, 37–8, 40, 51–9; use of the pressgang in, 34–7, 41–3, 50–3, 55–60.
Navestock (Essex), *see* Knavestock.
Neilson, Miss N., 186–7.
Netherlands, the, 14, 24, 74.
Nevill, George, Lord Abergavenny, 90.
Neville of Raby, Lord, 153–4.
Newbold-on-Avon (Warwickshire), 182.
Newcastle, 111, 129, 152.
New England, 50.
Newport (U.S.A.), 46.
New Providence (U.S.A.), 33 *n*., 47.
Newton (Worcs), 181–2.
New York, 47, 52.
Nicholas, Archdeacon, 180.
Nigel, bishop of Ely, 115.
Normandy, 107, 113, 126, 129.
Normans, the, 170.

North, Colonel, 87.
North America, 43–5, 53, 55, 58.
North German Confederation, the, 21, 23, 30.
Northampton, 108, 123, 126. Earl of, *see* Simon.
Northamptonshire, 118–19, 130, 175.
Northumberland, 129; earldom of, 111; earl of, *see* Henry of.
Norwich, bishop of. *See* William de Ayremynne.
Nôtre Dame (Paris), 30.
Nottingham, 106.
North, Francis, Lord, 84, 86 *n.*, 87, 96.

OAKHAM (Rutland), 133.
Ockham, William, 137.
Ogle, Sir Chaloner, Admiral, 44, 49, 54.
Oldenburg, Grand Duke of, 22–3.
Oliver, F. S., 2.
Olivier-Martin, M., 10.
Ordericus Vitalis, 105, 107.
Orleans, duke of. *See* Philip.
Ormsby-Gore, George Ralph Charles, Lord Harlech, 140.
Otto, Emperor, 153.
Oudh, 85.
Oundle (Northants), 175.
Overton, manor of (Hants), 189–90.
Oxford, 4, 123–4, 137, 155, 157–8, 161–2; Franciscan school at, 157; university of, 162.
Oxfordshire, 130, 182, 191.

PAGE, William, 2.
Palatinate, the, 159–60.
Palk, Robert, 98.
Palmerston, Lord, 29.
Papal Letters, Calendar of, 147.
Paris, 28–9, 63–4, 66, 69–70, 74–7, 81, 144, 150, 152.
Parker, Sir Peter, 53.
Parliament, *see* Select Committees.
Parliamentary Election (1784), 96–9.
Parsloe, C. G., 5.
Patent Rolls, 141.
Pauli, Reinhold, *Bilder aus Alt-England*, 152.
Paynel, John de, 139, 142.
Pegsdon (Beds), 177.
Pelham, Walter de, 172.
Percy, Henry, 153–4.
Pessagne, Anthony de, 147–8.
Peterborough, 173, 188–9; abbey of, 175; chronicle, 120.
Petrarch, 148–50.
Petrushevsky, Professor, 187.
Peverel, William, 134.
Philip, Duke of Orleans, 67, 72–3, 76.
Philip VI, King of France, 147, 151, 155.
Philippa, Queen of England, 147.
Philobiblon. *See* Richard de Bury and Thomas, E. C.
Pierrepoint, Evelyn, Duke of Kingston, 65–6.
Pipe Roll, 105–6, 108, 130.
Pipewell, Abbey (Northants), 119.
Pirenne, Henri, 3.
Pitt, William, 84, 85, 87–8, 99–101.
Place Name Society, 3.
Pole, William de la, 153.
Polish Rebellion, the (1863), 30.
Pollock, Sir Frederick, 2.
Pont-Sainte-Maxence (France), 147.
Poole, A. L., 128.
Popes. *See* Benedict XII, Clement V, Eugenius III and John XXII.
Port Royal (Jamaica), 39, 43.
Powicke, Professor F. M., 160.
Pressgang. Effects in the West Indies of the, 31–60.
Pretender, the Old. *See* James.
Pretender, the Young. *See* Charles.
Prince Regent. *See* William I, King of Prussia.
Privateers in West Indies. *See* Navy.
Prokesch, Freiherr von, 20.
Prothero, Lady, 3.
Prothero, Sir George, 8.
Prussia, kings of. *See* Frederick William IV, William I and William II.
Prussia, and the Eastern Question, relations between Austria and, 20–1, 23–6, 30, England and, 14–30, France and, 20–2, 25, 28–30, Germany and, 17–18, Russia and, 16, 18–19, 25–8, 30.
Public Record Office, London, 3.
Pudsey, Hugh, bishop of Durham, 176–7.

Queen Anne (ship), 32 *n.*

RADMORE, abbot of, 134.
Raine, James, 135.
Rait, Sir Robert, 2.
Ramsey (Hunts), 186–7, 190.
Ramsey Abbey (Hunts), 124, 176.
Ranulf (I), Vicomte of Bayeux, later Earl of Chester, 105–7.
Ranulf (II) de Gernons, Earl of Chester, acquisition of the honour of Lancaster by, 125–6, 129;

and the honour of Carlisle, 105, and the Welsh War, 110–12, 129; arrest of, 127; birth of, 104; career of, 103–4; characteristics of, 108–10, 133; coalition against King Stephen joined by, 128–9; death of, 131, 133–4; disappointed ambitions of, 112–19; effect of the Treaty of Wallingford upon, 133; grants made by, 134; inheritance of, 107–8; marriage of, 109; material relating to the career of, 103–4, 108, 119, 125, 128–9, 131; neutrality of, 125; parentage of, 104–7; rebellions of, 113–130; relations between Henry I and, 107–8, 110, Henry of Scotland and, 112–13, 128–9, Stephen and, 109–29, the Earl of Leicester and, 131–3, William de Roumare and, 108–9.
Raucester (Rocester), abbot of (Staffs), 134.
Ravenstone castle, (near Ashby-de-la-Zouch), 132.
Reading, Abbey of, 103 *n.*
Rebellion of the Fifteen, 61–2, 73.
Rechberg, Count, 24–5.
Redmild (Redmile), church of (Leics), 119.
Redvers, Baldwin de, 115.
Redworth, manor of (Durham), 177.
Regent of France. *See* Philip, Duke of Orleans.
Regulating Act (1773), 83–4.
Repton (Derbyshire), 109.
Revenge, the (ship), 33 *n.*
Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, 135.
Rhine, the, 152.
Rhineland, the, 18.
Rhode Island, 46 *n.*
Rhodes, Cecil, 14.
Ribble, the, river, 125.
Ricardus de sancto Edmundo, 137.
Richard, bishop of Bisaccia, 154 *n.*
Richard de Bury, ambassadorial career of, 144, 147–53, 155, 159, 161, 164; as a bibliophile, 135, 160–2; characteristics of, 155–63; clerks in the service of, 165; consecrated bishop of Durham, 137; date of birth of, 137; death of, 155, 163; education of, 137, 157–8; *Liber Epistolaris*, 135, 137–8, 140–4, 148, *Philobiblon*, 135–6, 154–9, 162, 165; ill-health of, 154; influence of, 161–2; Leicester Abbey Catalogue, 156; official career of, 137–40, 144–8, 150–53, 155, 159, 162, 164; origin of, 137; *Pater Sancte* letters of, 145; pluralism of, 146; preferments, 137–8, 146–7, 149–50, 155, 159, 164, 166–8; relations between Edward III and, 138–40, 144–9, 152–7, 159–60, 163; works of, 140–3, 155–6, 158–9.
Richardson, H. G., 10.
Richmond, Earl of. *See* Alan, Count of Brittany.
Ripon, 117; church, 122.
Ripple (Worcs), 181.
Robert, bishop of Lincoln, 131 *n.*
Robert, Earl of Derby, 132.
Robert, Earl of Gloucester, 109, 114, 128.
Robert de Winchelsea, archbishop of Canterbury, 137.
Robinson, Sir Thomas, Governor, 32 *n.*, 50.
Robinson, John, 90–6, 98–9.
Rochester, bishop of. *See* Atterbury, Francis.
Roger, Earl of Warwick, 112.
Roger de Northburgh, bishop of Coventry, 151.
Rolls. *See* Close, Hundred, Patent, and Pipe.
Rolls Series, the, 155.
Roman Roll, 140–1.
Rome, 63–4, 70, 74–5, 77–8, 140.
Rostherne (Cheshire), 139.
Roumare, William de, 105–9, 113–15, 117, 121.
Round, John Horace, 110, 121–3, 128–9.
Rous, Boughton, 86.
Royal Historical Society, the, and the British National Committee, 6, 10; and the British Records Association, 8; and the development of historical study, 1, 3; annual bibliography, 5, 9; Associates, 8; Camden series, 9; changes in the fellowship of, 2–3; formulation of a "definite policy" by, 7–8; library, 7–8; meetings, 11–12; Prothero Bequest, 8–9; *Transactions*, 8, 11.
Rufus, Richard, 179–80.
Runwell, Hugh de, 179.
Runwell (Essex), 179.
Russell, John, Earl, 3.

Russia, relations between Austria and, 26; England and, 16, 27, France and, 16, 26, Germany and, 15–16, 18, Prussia and, 16, 18–19, 25–8, 30.
Ryton, manor of (Durham), 177–8.

St. Albans, 123.
St. Bernard of Clairvaux, 133.
St. Domingue, 46 *n.*, 58.
St. Edmundsbury (Suffolk), 137.
St. Eustatius (Windward Islands), 45.
St. Ives, manor of (Hants), 190.
St. Kitts (W. Indies), 34, 49.
St. Lo, Commodore, 39, 51 *n.*
St. Mary (church), Bridlington, 122.
St. Mary, convent of, Lincoln, 119.
St. Mary de Pré, Leicester, 130, 132.
St. Mary's Priory, Worcester, 185.
St. Paul (Herts), 173, 180, 185.
St. Petersburg, 16, 26, 28–9.
St. Werburgh, Abbey of (Chester), 134.
Salisbury, Lord. *See* Cecil, Robert Arthur Talbot Gascoigne.
Sandon (Herts), 179.
Sayer, James, 89.
Sawbridgeworth (Herts), 138, 146, 149 *n.*
Sayles, G. O., 10.
Schaub, Sir Luke, 66–7.
Schleinitz, Baron von, 27.
Schleswig-Holstein, 26, 30.
Scotland, war between England and, 110–11; and the honour of Lancaster, 111.
Scots, King of. *See* David.
Scott, Major John, 88–9, 92, 98.
Scott, William, 87.
Scotus, Joannes, 137.
Scriptores Tres, 136.
Scrope, Sir Richard, 153–4.
Sebastopol, 20.
Seebohm, Frederick, 183.
Segrave, Walter, 165.
Select and Secret Committees (1772), (1781), 83, 85.
Seven Years' War, the, 42, 55, 60.
Shaftesbury (Dorset), 180, 183–4.
Shakespeare, William, 87.
Sherborne (Dorset), 182.
Sheridan, Richard, 97.
Ships. *See* Dowdall, Queen Anne, Revenge and White.
Shireburn, Robert de, 139.
Shirley, Governor, 55 *n.*
Shitlington (Bedford), 177.
Simon, bishop of Worcester, 181.
Simon, Earl of Northampton, 132.
Simon le Waleys, 172.
Smith, Mr., 98.
Smith, Nathaniel, 94.
Somerset, Henry, Duke of Beaufort, 90.
Somerville, Sir Philip de, 162.
South Biddick, manor of (Durham), 177.
Southesk, Lord, 74.
Southwark, London, 96.
Spanish Succession, War of the, 52, 57 *n.*
Spencer, Augustus William Frederick, Lord Loftus, 29.
Stafford, 97, 112 *n.*
Staffordshire, 106, 112 *n.*, 130, 134, 190.
Stamford (Lincs), 120–1.
Standard, battle of the, 111, 114 *n.*
Stapleford, Richard of, 180.
Stenton, Professor F. M., 115, 132, 189.
Stephen, King of England, 104, 107, 110, 112–29, 133.
Stern, Alfred, 3.
Stockton-on-Tees, 177.
Stoke Albany (Northants), 119.
Strafford, Lord. *See* Wentworth, Thomas.
Stratford, John, Archbishop of Canterbury, 149, 152–3.
Stretton, manor of (Staffs), 190.
Stuart MSS, 61–2, 65, 70.
Stubbs, William, 109–10.
Sulivan, Laurence, 88, 94–5, 98.
Surtees Society, the, 136.
Sussex, 130.
Sykes, Mr., 98.

Taillebois, Ivo de, 105.
Tanner, Thomas, 2.
Tayler, Alistair, 61.
Tayler, Henrietta, 61.
Templars, the, 181–3, 190.
Temple, Lord. *See* Grenville, George Nugent-Temple.
Temple, Mary, 190.
Thames, the, river, 84, 123.
The Old Chevalier, 61.
Thomas, E. C., *Philobiblon.* (ed. by), 135, 155.
Thomas, Governor, 32 *n.*
Thomas of Capua, 142.
Thompson, Beilby, 90 *n.*
Thomson, Captain, 50.
Thorold the Sheriff, 104, 106.

Thucydides, 87.
Thurlow, Edward, Lord, 85, 87–8.
Thurstan, archbishop of York, 122 *n.*
Tibritton, manor of (Worcester), 185
Tickhill, William de, 150–2.
Tickhill (Yorks), 120.
Tilshead (Wilts), 183.
Tisbury (Wilts), 184.
Tomlinson, Nicholas, 42.
Tomlinson, Robert, 42.
Tout, Professor T. F., 138–140, 145, 147–8.
Townsend, Charles, Vice-Admiral, 54.
Townshend, George, Lord, 88.
Treaties. *See* Wallingford.
Tredington (Worcs), 181.
Trelawny, Governor, 32 *n.*, 34–5, 42, 44–6, 49, 54, 57.
Trent, the, river, 106, 154.
Trentham, priory of (Staffs), 134.
Trillesden, manor of (Durham), 177.
Trinity, Cartulary of the, Abbey of the, (Caen), 183.
Trussel, William, 151.
Turgis of Avranches, *see* Avranches.
Tweed, the, river, 129.
Tyne, the, river, 129.
Tysoe (Warwickshire), 182.

UFFORD, John, 164.
Ultima Thule, 157.
Usedom, Freiherr von, 20–1.

VANSITTART, Mr., 98.
Venice, 143.
Vere, Aubrey de, 123.
Vernon, Admiral, 35, 39, 43–5, 53–4.
Vezian, Peter, 33 *n.*
Victoria, Queen of England, 13–15, 29.
Victoria County Histories, 2, 4.
Vienna, 23, 26 ; conference at (1855), 20.
Vienne, Council of, 157.
Vigne, Pierre de la, 142–3.
Villiers, George William Frederick, Lord Clarendon, 17, 19, 21, 24–5.
Vinogradoff, Paul, 176, 182, 187.
Vulgate, the, 158.

WALES, relations between England and, 110–11, 126–7.
Wallingford, siege of (1146), 126, 133 ; treaty of, 133.
Walpole, Horatio, 69, 79.
Walter, archdeacon of Leicester, 119–20.
Walter de Pelham, 172.
Wanley, Humphry, 2.
Wars. *See* American Revolution, Austro-Prussian, Crimean, Franco-Austrian, Franco-German, Jenkin's Ear, Seven Years, Spanish Succession.
Warden-Law, manor of (Durham), 177–8.
Wardon. *See* Warden-Law.
Warren, Peter, Commodore, 47, 49, 54.
Warwick, Earl of. *See* Roger.
Warwickshire, 182.
Watts, Amelia, 90 *n.*
Wedderburn, Alexander, Lord Loughborough, 88.
Wells (Somerset), 147.
Wentworth, Brigadier, 43.
Wentworth, Thomas, Lord Strafford, 69, 80.
Wentworth - Fitzwilliam, William, Lord Fitzwilliam, 86.
West Auckland (Durham), 177.
West Indies. *See* Navy.
Weston, manor of (Yorks), 177–8.
Westminster, Matthew of. *See* Matthew.
Wharton, Henry, 136.
Whickham, manor of (Durham), 177–8.
Whitby, visitation of (1366), 154 *n.*
White Ship, 105.
Whitwick (Leics), 132.
Wilkinson, Jacob, 87, 91, 93.
Willard, J. F., 2.
William, archbishop of Canterbury, 110.
William III, King of England, 51.
William I, King of Prussia, 28–9.
William II, King of Prussia, 13, 17, 20, 24.
William Fitzherbert, archbishop of York, 117.
William of Albemarle, Earl of York, 122.
William the Marshal, 155.
Williams, Captain, 41 *n.*
Willoughby, John de, 137.
Wiltshire, 176, 183.
Winchester, 121 ; bishop of, *see* Adam de Orlton ; bishopric of, 187, 189–91.
Windsor Castle, 61, 78.

Winlaton, manor of (Durham), 177–8.
Woodmancote (Worcs), 181.
Worcester bishops of, *see* Alverd, John and Simon; bishopric of, 180; earl of, *see* Beaumont, Waleran de.
Worsfold, Sir Cato, 3.
Wraxall, Mr., 98.
Wymble, James, 51 *n.*

YORK, 121, 123, 129, 146, 152; archbishops of, *see* Murdac, Henry; Fitzherbert, William; and Thurstan, earl of, *see* William of Albemarle.
Yorkshire, 124–5, 129, 182, 187.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL. SESSION 1935–1936.

THE Council of the Royal Historical Society have the honour of presenting the Annual Report to the General Meeting of Fellows as follows :—

By the lamented death of His Majesty King George V the Society lost its Royal Patron. His Majesty King Edward VIII was graciously pleased upon his accession to the throne to grant his patronage to the Society.

The most difficult question which has come before the Council during the Session has been the problem created by the expiry in March 1939 of the Society's lease of No. 22 Russell Square. The figures laid before the Council by a special committee appointed by them to investigate the situation made it clear that the cost to the Society of remaining in its present quarters, upon any terms that they were likely to obtain from the Bedford Estate, would be such as to reduce the moneys available for publications and the library by more than two-thirds, and to limit publications to an annual volume of *Transactions*. While this loss to the publications and library fund could have been made good out of the income of the Prothero bequest, the Council took the view that the wishes of Sir George Prothero, as expressed in his will, would have been in effect defeated by the transfer to the Prothero Fund of costs of publication hitherto borne by general funds, in order to release those funds for expenditure upon other purposes. The Council were therefore brought reluctantly to the conclusion that the Society must remove from its present quarters.

The search for new quarters has involved the Council in long negotiations and much anxiety. To the ordinary necessity of taking a decision rapidly when a favourable offer was received, there has been added the need to keep in step the arrangements for the lease of new premises and those for the termination of the agreements with the

Society's present tenants, in order to reduce to a minimum the cost to the Society of the occupation of two premises at once. The Council had also in mind the great importance of concluding the negotiations expeditiously if the Society's lease of 22 Russell Square were to have a surrender value. In these circumstances, since the problem was one which could not usefully be discussed in the abstract and without concrete proposals and precise figures, and the Council have had to consider a variety of suggestions and to watch a situation liable to change from month to month by reason of the occurrence of new offers or the acquisition of fresh information, they have found themselves unable to take the whole body of Fellows effectively into consultation, and were obliged to act upon their own responsibility.

The Council made prolonged and extensive search for new quarters in the Bloomsbury area. All the information which they collected then, and any figures of which they have learned since, point to the conclusion that the Society could only obtain quarters in the Bloomsbury area, comparable to those which it now occupies, at a cost which would seriously hamper its activities as a publishing Society, and in view of the fact that only one-fifth of the Fellows of the Society live in London and its immediate neighbourhood, the Council were of the opinion that there could be no justification for heavy expenditure upon housing at the cost of publications.

Having come to such an opinion, the Council were faced with the choice of taking either a smaller house or mere offices in Bloomsbury, or moving into another neighbourhood. To take a smaller house would, it was thought, be merely to burden the Society with all the cares and responsibilities of a householder without providing it with the ample accommodation, the desire for which is the sole reason for having anything more than offices at all. The decision to resort to rooms elsewhere rather than to limit the Society's premises to mere administrative offices and library store-room was only reached with much greater hesitation. It might have been possible to secure for £350–£400 a year adequate office accommodation in Bloomsbury, together with a small library and extra room for the storage of books, and to obtain from some other body, at a small extra charge, the use of rooms for Council meetings and the meetings of the Society, but such an arrangement would not properly meet the requirements of the Society. While it is true that the Society is in a large measure a Society devoted to the publication of historical materials, it has also other important functions. It has social obligations as the principal organisation representing English historical scholarship, and it has a valuable library. The Council are strongly of opinion that the Society could not fulfil its duties as a representative of English historical scholarship as the tenant of rooms hired for the occasion and belonging to some other body, and without having premises of its own of some character and dignity; and with respect to the library, while it is true that if the library is regarded, as it has been in the past, as a lending library, it could still serve that purpose quite conveniently although a considerable part of it might be kept in a book-stack, the Council are of the opinion that the development of library services in the country during recent years has been so great that small use is likely to be made (or indeed is made) of the library as a lending library and that it will be of greater service to historical studies as a library of special character, housed in such a way as to be conveniently consulted on the shelves, and in rooms in which proper accommodation can be provided for readers. The Council therefore were forced to the conclusion that the Society must move.

The Council have therefore negotiated and propose to sign a lease of premises on the ground floor of No. 96 Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, for the term of 21 years, with the option of renewal for a further 25 years, at a rental of £200 p.a. The premises comprise a Fellows' library, a council room, offices and pantry, together with the use of cloakrooms, and of the garden on the occasion of the Society's annual party, and the further use, at a small extra charge, of an extremely fine room upon the first floor for the Society's meetings. The house is situate on the Chelsea embankment close to Battersea Bridge.

Lindsey House, of which the premises form a part, is described in the London County Council's *Survey of London*, vol. iv, *The Parish of Chelsea*, pt. ii, 1913, pp. 35–42. There is a plan of it on plate 33, and an illustration of the front of No. 96 on plate 36. The original building was the principal farmhouse on Sir Thomas More's estate. Lindsey House is thought to have been built in its present external form by the third Earl of Lindsey in 1674. It was sold in 1751 to Count Zinzendorf to form the headquarters of a proposed colony of Moravians, and was occupied by Zinzendorf and a number of brethren. In 1770 it was again sold, and was reconstructed in 1775 as seven houses. No. 96 was occupied by Whistler from 1866 to 1878.

It is estimated that the total cost of rent, rates, and establishment charges will be a little less than that of offices in Bloomsbury. Should the location prove to be a serious obstacle to the use of the premises by the Fellows, and should the expectations entertained by the Council that the house will become well known as a worthy home of the Society be disappointed, the Society will be in no worse position than if it had taken offices in Bloomsbury. It will be neither more difficult, nor more disadvantageous, nor more costly to hire a room in some central place for the meetings of the Society. But the Council have, after long and very careful consideration, every confidence that the adoption of such a course will not be necessary, and that the Society can look forward to a further development of its activities in Chelsea.

Further progress has been made with the reorganisation of the Society's library, and sets of the publications of a number of record societies, of which a list will be found in the appendix to this report, have been acquired.

At the Annual General Meeting held on February 13, 1936, the Right Hon. Winston Spencer Churchill and Dr. G. P. Gooch were elected Honorary Vice-Presidents. The Vice-Presidents retiring under By-law XVII were Dr. A. G. Little and Dr. Eleanor Lodge. Dr. Rose Graham and Professor A. P. Newton were elected Vice-Presidents to fill the vacancies. The Members of Council retiring under By-law XVII were Professor G. A. R. Callender, Professor H. H. Dodwell, Professor Lillian Penson and Dr. C. W. Previté-Orton. Dr. A. Aspinall, Miss H. M. Cam, Dr. R. R. Darlington, and R. Pares were elected Members of Council.

A. E. Stamp was appointed auditor for the Council; J. Holland Walker and Dr. W. T. Whitley auditors for the Fellows.

By-law XII was amended to read: "Every Ordinary Fellow of the Society shall, during the term of his subscription, be entitled to receive all the publications of the Society except the annual volume of *Writings on English History*, and every Corresponding Member and Associate a copy of the *Transactions* free of expense. Every Ordinary Fellow shall, during the term of his subscription, be entitled to buy one copy of the *Writings* at a reduction of 25 per cent. of the published price, and every Associate one copy of the *Writings* and of each of the other *Publications* of the Society upon the same terms."

The following papers were read during the Session 1935–36:—

"British Commercial and Shipping Statistics, 1696–1782." By Professor G. N. Clark, M.A. (October 10, 1935.)

"The Holles Family." By A. C. Wood, M.A., D.Phil. (November 14, 1935.)

"The Nature and Use of the Westminster Abbey Muniments." By L. E. Tanner, M.V.O., M.A., F.S.A. (December 12, 1935.)

"The King's Secretary, in the Fifteenth Century." By Miss J. Otway-Ruthven, M.A., Ph.D. (January 9, 1936.)

"Some Proposed Legislation of Henry VIII." By Professor T. F. T. Plucknett, M.A., LL.B. (March 12, 1936.)

"English Learning in the Late Twelfth Century." By R. W. Hunt, M.A. (May 14, 1936.)

The President, Professor F. M. Powicke, M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A., delivered an address at the Anniversary Meeting on February 13, 1936, his subject being " Reflections on the Medieval State."

The Alexander Medal was awarded to Miss R. J. Mitchell, M.A., B.Litt., for an essay entitled " English Students at Padua, 1460–1475."

The Presidential Address and the Alexander Essay, with the above papers and a Communication on " Parliamentary Elections and Electioneering in 1685 " received from Professor R. H. George, Ph.D., of Providence, R.I., U.S.A., were printed in *Transactions*, Fourth Series, Vol. XIX.

In addition to the volume of *Transactions* there were issued in December, 1935, Camden Fourth Series, Volume LI, *Rotuli Parliamentorum Anglie hactenus inediti*, and in October, 1936, Volume LII, *Camden Miscellany, vol. XVI*, edited by F. J. Fisher, Professor Sir E. Denison Ross, L. G. Wickham Legg, F. W. Brooks, and H. Hulme.

The following volumes were almost ready for the press at the same date :—

John of Gaunt's Register, Vols. III and IV, edited by the late Miss Eleanor Lodge and R. Somerville.

The " *Liber Pilosus* " *of St. Paul's Cathedral*, edited by Miss Marion Gibbs, with a preface by Professor Stenton.

The above volumes will be published in the Camden Series. Besides these a *List of British Diplomatic Representatives, 1509–1689*, edited by R. B. Wernham, assisted by S. T. Bindoff, Miss D. M. Brodie, J. F. Chance, J. J. S. Shaw and F. J. Weaver, a volume of the *Proceedings under the Dictum of Kenilworth*, edited by Professor Powicke and M. Tyson, and an edition of the *Letters of Princess Lieven, 1832–52*, edited by E. Jones Parry, were in preparation, while four more volumes were in immediate preparation in the new series recently planned, namely, *British Chronology*, *British Currency*, *British Commercial and Shipping Statistics, 1696–1782*, and a *List of Parliamentary Papers, 1700–1800.*

On Friday, July 10, the Society gave an afternoon party to meet the members of the Anglo-American Conference of Historians. The rooms of the Society were used for meetings of the British Archæological Association, the Canterbury and York Society, the Central London Branch of the Historical Association, the Huguenot Society of London, the Japan Society, the Lingard Society and the Royal Numismatic Society.

The Council have, with regret, to record the deaths of 20 Fellows during the Session, including Miss M. V. Clarke, a member of Council from 1934 until her death, Sir Charles Firth, a member of Council from 1897 to 1904, President from 1913 to 1917, and a Vice-President from 1904 to 1913 and 1917 until his death, Canon C. W. Foster, a member of Council from 1925 to 1928 and 1929 to 1932, Miss Eleanor Lodge, a member of Council from 1923 to 1927 and a Vice-President from 1928 to 1932 and 1933 to 1936, Sir Richard Lodge, President from 1929 to 1933 and a Vice-President from 1926 to 1929 and 1933 until his death, Professor Pirenne, a Corresponding Member from 1913 until his death, Sir Robert Rait, an Honorary Vice-President from 1933 until his death, Professor Alfred Stern, a Corresponding Member from 1935 until his death, Professor J. F. Willard, an Honorary Vice-President from 1934 until his death, and Sir T. Cato Worsfold, the Honorary Solicitor, from 1914 until his death.

The Council wish to place on record an appreciation of the loss sustained by the Society in the deaths of Sir Charles Firth, Sir Richard Lodge and Sir Cato Worsfold. Sir Charles Firth and Sir Richard Lodge were former Presidents of the Society and very influential members of the Council. Sir Cato Worsfold rendered for 30 years most valuable services to the Society as Honorary Solicitor and legal adviser.

In addition, 14 Fellows have been lost by resignation, 7 by removal from the roll for non-payment of subscriptions, and 2 libraries by resignation.

40 new Fellows and 12 Associates were elected, 4 Fellows

were reinstated and 7 Libraries were admitted as subscribing libraries.

The membership of the Society on October 31, 1936, was 915 Fellows, including Ordinary, Life, Honorary and Corresponding Fellows, and 31 Associates. There were 280 subscribing libraries. Of the Fellows 3 were Honorary, 44 were Corresponding and 163 were Life Fellows. The net result was an increase of 3 Fellows, 12 Associates and 5 Libraries. There were 39 Societies, British and foreign, which exchanged their publications with the *Transactions* and *Camden Series* of the Society.

The Treasurer reports that the income of the year ending October 31, 1936, exceeded the expenditure chargeable against it by £291 0*s.* 7*d.* It should be noted, however, that allocations to the fund in aid of Pensions, Lease Renewal Fund and the Library amount to £508 11*s.* 2*d.*—see Balance Sheet. Thus the Surplus of Assets over Liabilities as shown by the Balance Sheet is reduced from £3,710 18*s.* at October 31, 1935, to £3,493 7*s.* 5*d.* at October 31, 1936. During the year the Council purchased £465 Local Loans 3% Stock, £400 of which has been allocated equally between the Lease Renewal Fund and the Fund in aid of Pensions. These two funds with accumulated interest now stand respectively in the Balance Sheet at £1,201 7*s.* 10*d.* and £1,399 1*s.* 4*d.*

The Capital Liabilities, £5,609 0*s.* 2*d.*, are fully secured against the Society's investments shown in the Balance Sheet at £6,747 19*s.* The market value of these securities at October 31, 1936, was £8,531 5*s.* 10*d.* In addition to this amount there was on Deposit at the Bank the sum of £1,100 7*s.* 5*d.*

Appended to the Society's own Accounts are separate Accounts for the Prothero Trust and the David Berry Trust. These have been duly audited.

The final Account has now been received from the Trustees of the late Sir George W. Prothero and the balance of Investments has been transferred to the Society. It is therefore now possible to state that the value of the total bequest amounted to £21,651 16*s*. 8*d*. This figure is based on the valuation on June 24, 1936, of the investments now held of the late Sir George W. Prothero. Other investments, being those made by the Society out of the proceeds of sale of certain securities and the furniture, surplus books and the lease of 24 Bedford Square, are included at cost.

APPENDIX

The publications of the following Record Societies have been added to those already in the Library.

Bedfordshire Historical Record Society. *Publications*, vols. I–XVIII (1913–36); *Quarto Memoirs*, I–III (1922–32); *Survey of Ancient Buildings*, I–III (1931–36); Three Maps (1933).

Bristol Record Society. *Publications*, I–VI (1930–35).

British Record Society. *Index library*, I–LXI (1888–1936). *Wants* XXXV, XLVI.

Devon and Cornwall Record Society. *Publications*, parts 1–43 (1905–36); *Extra Series*, no. I (1912).

English Place-Name Society. *Publications*, I–XIII (1925–36).

Kent Archæological Society—Records Branch. *Kent Records*, I–XIII (1912–33); *Monumental Inscriptions*, I, II (1919, 1927).

Lincoln Record Society. *Publications*, I–XXIX (1911–35).

Norfolk Record Society. *Publications*, I–VIII (1931–36).

Northamptonshire Record Society. *Publications*, I–VII (1928–1935).

Oxford Historical Society. *Publications*, I–C (1884–1936).

Oxfordshire Record Society. *Publications*, I–XVII (1919–35).

Record Society for Lancashire and Cheshire. *Publications*, I–LXXXVIII (1878–1936).

Somerset Record Society. *Publications*, I–L (1887–1935). *Wants* V, VI, VII, XXVII, XXXV. *Extra Series*, I (1931).

Southampton Record Society. *Publications*, I–XXXV (1905–1936). *Wants* III, XXV, XXVI, XXIX, XXXI–XXXIII, XXXV.

Staffordshire Record Society (formerly William Salt Archæological Society). *Collections*, 1880–1936. *Wants*, new ser., V, VI pt. 2, VII–IX, XI.

Surrey Record Society. *Publications*, nos. 1–37 (1913–35).

Surtees Society. *Publications*, I–XCIX (1835–1934). *Wants* III, XXV–XXVII, XXXIII, XXXV, XL, CXXI.

Sussex Record Society. *Publications*, I–XL (1902–35).

Worcestershire Historical Society. *Publications*, 1898–1935 (1898–35).

Yorkshire Archæological Society. *Record Series*, I–XCII (1885–1936).

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

I.—Income and Expenditure for the Year ended October 31, 1936.

Income.		£ s. d.
Arrears of Subscriptions	£79 13 0	
Less amount estimated to be received in last year's accounts for subscriptions in arrear	35 0 0	
Subscriptions in arrear, received in excess of estimate		44 13 0
Subscriptions now in arrear estimated to be received		35 0 0
Subscriptions of 1936:—		
1 at 20s.	1 0 0	
34 at 21s.	35 14 0	
277 at 30s.	415 10 0	
670 at 42s.	1407 0 0	
		1859 4 0
Life subscriptions	111 6 0	
Less proportion required by By-law IX to be invested (see Balance-sheet)	74 4 0	
		37 2 0
Dividends on Investments		206 16 6
Interest on Deposit Account at Bank		6 1 6
Rentals of parts of 22 Russell Square let to Tenants		300 4 0
		£2489 1 0

Expenditure.		£ s. d.
Publications: Printing, Distributing, Editing and Indexing:		
Expenditure in the Year	£815 8 7	
Add reserved for Printers' Outstanding Account	841 0 0	
	1656 8 7	
Less Amount reserved at October 31, 1935	742 0 0	
	914 8 7	
Deduct received from Sales	29 5 9	
		885 2 10
Salaries and Wages		684 5 0
Rent, 22 Russell Square		170 0 0
Coal		15 11 10
Electric Light, Gas, etc.		18 16 3
Rates (Parochial, etc.) and Taxes		188 10 6
General Printing and Stationery (including Cost of Typewriter, £34 17s. 0d.)		89 4 11
Library: see Balance Sheet.		0 0 0
Postages, etc.		37 6 7
Premises, 22 Russell Square: upkeep, repairs, etc.		39 17 1
Insurance (Fire, National Health, etc.)		14 19 3
Monthly Meetings (cost of Refreshments)		18 3 4
Alexander Medal		3 5 0
Address to University of London		3 3 0
Contribution to British Committee of International Congress		15 15 0
Sundries (Petty Cash payments)		13 19 10
		2198 0 5
Balance, being excess of Income over Expenditure		291 0 7
		£2489 1 0

II.—BALANCE-SHEET AS AT OCTOBER 31, 1936.

Liabilities.			£ s. d.
Life subscriptions required to be invested as Capital Account (By-law IX): amount brought forward from last Balance-sheet		£2928 14 0	
Proportion of Life subscriptions received in 1936 (see Income and Expenditure Account)		74 4 0	3002 18 0
Lease Renewal Fund:			
Balance from last Account		975 14 9	
Add Cost of £200 Local Loans 3%		194 5 7	
Interest received		31 7 6	1201 7 10
Fund in aid of Pensions:			
Balance from last account		1166 8 3	
Add Cost of £200 Local Loans 3%		194 5 7	
Interest received		38 7 6	1399 1 4
Library Fund:			
Balance from last Account		79 16 7	
Add Receipts		65 19 4	
		145 15 11	
Less Purchases		140 2 11	5 13 0
			5609 0 2
Library Grant:			
Balance from last Account		1 8 10	
Add Further Grants		120 0 0	
		121 8 10	
Less expended		103 2 8	18 6 2
Subscriptions received in advance			16 16 0
Amount reserved as due to Printers			841 0 0
Balance, being surplus of Assets over Liabilities at date, viz., Amount brought forward from last Account		3710 18 0	
Deduct Fund in aid of Pensions (above)	£194 5 7		
Lease Renewal Fund (above)	194 5 7		
Library allocations (above)	120 0 0	508 11 2	
		3202 6 10	
Add Excess of Income over Expenditure as per Account I		291 0 7	3493 7 5
			£9978 9 9

General Assets.		£ s. d.
Investments, viz.:—		
Consols 2½%, £699 9s. 9d. valued at	£314 0 0	
India 3½% Stock, £900 valued at in 1920	500 0 0	
Canada 3½% Stock, £300 valued at	200 0 0	
500 National Savings Certificates at cost	400 0 0	
Conversion Stock 5%, £879 3s. 6d. at cost	826 3 1	
Conversion Stock 4½%, £1220 at cost	1177 2 3	
Conversion Stock 3½%, £2823 0s. 1d. at cost	2408 18 9	
Metropolitan Water Board 4½% "D" Stock, £400 at cost.	470 1 0	
Local Loans 3%, £465 at cost	451 13 11	6747 19 0
[The market value of the above investments on October 31, 1936, was £8531 5s. 10d.]		
Cash at Bank: Current Account	£95 2 5	
" Deposit "	1100 7 5	
Petty Cash Balance in hand	0 0 11	1195 10 9
Stock of Publications at Russell Square (value as insured)		100 0 0
Stock of Publications with Printer (value as insured)		500 0 0
Library (value as insured)		1000 0 0
" Manuscripts (value as insured)		100 0 0
Furniture, etc. (value as insured)		300 0 0
Subscriptions in arrear estimated to be received (see Income and Expenditure Account		35 0 0
		£9978 9 9

(*Signed*) M. S. GIUSEPPI, *Hon. Treasurer*

AUDITORS' REPORT.

The above Statement of Income and Expenditure and Balance-sheet have been prepared from the Books and Vouchers, and we hereby certify the same to be correct, and to exhibit a true statement of the Society's financial position.

(*Signed*) A. E. STAMP
W. T. WHITLEY
J. HOLLAND WALKER
Auditors.

C. RYLAND BEEBY & Co., Chartered Accountants,
66, Basinghall Street, E.C.2.
3rd *December*, 1936.

THE PROTHERO TRUST

The late Sir George W. Prothero, by Will proved the 22 day of September 1922, bequeathed the residue of his property to the Society upon trust for (1) the promotion of historical research, (2) the acquisition and maintenance of a library dealing with the history of the British Empire, and (3) other purposes of the Society.

1.—INCOME AND EXPENDITURE FOR THE YEAR ENDED OCTOBER 31, 1936.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Dividends and Interest	737	19	10	Salary of Assistant Officer in connection with Historical Research	300	0	0
Royalties	12	3	9	Clerical Assistance	82	10	0
Income Tax refunded, 1934–5 and 1935–6	280	12	5	Premium on Pension Fund for Assistant Officer	10	8	10
				Binding and Repair of Library Books	52	12	2
				Printing, Stationery and Sundries	10	2	8
					455	13	8
				Balance: Excess of Income over Expenditure carried to Balance Sheet of Income	575	2	4
	£1030	16	0		£1030	16	0

2.—BALANCE SHEET OF THE INCOME OF THE TRUST, AS AT OCTOBER 31, 1936.

		£	s.	d.			£	s.	d.
Surplus Income Account:					Cash at Bank:				
As at October 31, 1935	£523 18 6				Current Account	£107 3 8			
Add Excess of Income over Expenditure in the year ended October 31, 1936	575 2 4				Deposit Account	161 4 2			
		1099	0	10			268	7	10
					Amount due from Capital Account		830	13	0
		£1099	0	10			£1099	0	10

3.—BALANCE SHEET OF THE CAPITAL OF THE TRUST, AS AT OCTOBER 31, 1936.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Amount of the Capital of the Trust arrived at as follows:						
Balance as at October 31, 1935 .	19,169	9	9			
Add Nominal Value of Securities since taken over from the Trustees of the late Sir G. W. Prothero .	1838	8	9			
Cash received from the Trustees in settlement of final account .	710	18	4			
	21,718	16	10			
Less Decrease in valuation of Securities—see *contra*. . . .	67	0	2	21,651	16	8
Amount due to Income Account				830	13	0
				£22,482	9	8

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Investments:						
As at October 31, 1935 . .	18,687	2	9			
Less Realizations	2348	3	8			
	16,338	19	1			
Add Further Securities taken over from Trustees—Nominal Value .	1838	8	9			
Society's Investments, at cost .	4372	2	0			
	£22,549	9	10			
Less Amount required to reduce to Valuation as per appended Schedules	67	0	2	22,482	9	8
				£22,482	9	8

We have examined the above accounts and find them to be in accord with the books and vouchers relating to the Fund.

C. Ryland Beeby & Co., Chartered Accountants,
66, Basinghall Street, E.C.2.
December 3rd, 1936.

A. E. Stamp
W. T. Whitley
J. Holland Walker
Hon. Auditors,
Royal Historical Society.

THE PROTHERO TRUST

A.—LIST OF SECURITIES RECEIVED FROM THE TRUSTEES OF SIR G. W. PROTHERO STILL HELD AT OCTOBER 31, 1936—AS PER VALUATION DATED JUNE 24, 1936.

	£	s.	d.
Assoc. Elec. Industries, Ltd., £80 8% Preference Stock Units	155	0	0
Australian Merc. Land & Finance Co., Ltd., £1000 4% Debenture Stock	990	0	0
Brazil 4½% 1883, £300 Stock	52	10	0
British Columbia Elec. Rly., Ltd., £350 4½% Debenture Stock	343	0	0
£375 5% Cum. Perpetual Preference Stock	378	15	0
British Oxygen Co., Ltd., £250 Ordinary Stock	1287	10	0
Buenos Ayres Western Rly. Co., £600 Ordinary Stock	69	0	0
Chilian 4½% 1886, £100 Stock	15	10	0
Central Argentine Rly. Co., £300 Consolidated Ordinary Stock	25	10	0
£200 4½% Preference Stock	53	0	0
Conversion Loan, £731 Stock 3½%	785	16	6
Conversion Loan, £731 13s. 9d. Stock 4½%	796	12	6
Arthur Guinness Son & Co., Ltd., £250 6% Preference Stock	390	0	0
Idaho Irrigation Co., Ltd., $2000 6% Adjustment Mortgage 15-year Gold Bonds	Not valued		
Imperial Continental Gas Assn., £506 5% Capital Stock	784	6	0
London Elec. Supply Corpn., Ltd., 75 6% Preference Shares of £5 each	553	2	6
London Midland & Scottish Rly., £200 5% Redeem. Preference Stock	212	10	0
£500 4% Preference Stock 1923	338	15	0
London & North Eastern Rly. Co., £550 4% 1st Guaranteed Stock	544	10	0
£100 4% 2nd Preference Stock	23	5	0
£80 5% Preference Ordinary Stock	7	18	0
Carried forward	7806	10	6
Brought forward	7806	10	6
Mexican Rly. Co., £300 6% Debenture Stock	21	0	0
Mexican Rly. Co., £28 4s. 8d. 4½% Reg. Stock "A" issue		16	11
North Eastern Elec. Supply Co., £300 7% Cum. Preference Shares	532	10	0
P. & O. Steam Nav. Co., £500 5% Cum. Preference Stock	520	0	0
Port of London Authority, £110 17s. 2d. 3½% Registered Stock 1965/75	116	19	1
Primitiva Holdings Ltd., £91 Ordinary Stock Units	47	15	6
R.M. Realization Co., Ltd., 75 Ordinary Shares of £1 each	155	12	6
£137 5% Income Debenture Stock	145	4	5
Rio Claro Rly. & Investment Co., £350 5% Debenture Stock	402	10	0
Southampton Gas Light & Coke Co., £600 5% Ordinary Stock	696	0	0
£200 5% Redeem. Debenture Stock	218	0	0
Southend Waterworks Co., 40 Shares of £10 each	515	0	0
Utah Gas Co., 3 Participating Pref. Shares of $100 each	Not valued		
10 Preferred Shares of $100 each	Not valued		
Vancouver Power Co., Ltd., £200 4¼% Guar. Debenture Stock	196	0	0
War Loan, £4052 4s. 4d. 3½% Stock	4295	7	0
Waste Heat and Gas Elec. Generating Stations Ltd., 165 4% Preference Shares of 10s. each	82	10	0
330 Ordinary Shares of 10s. each	165	0	0
Worthington & Co., Ltd., £500 3½% "B" Mortgage Deb. Stock	495	0	0
Robert Younger, Ltd., 25 Preference Shares of £10 each	243	15	0
	£16,655	10	11

B.—LIST OF SECURITIES PURCHASED BY THE SOCIETY FROM PROCEEDS OF SALE OF THE LEASE, ETC., OF 24 BEDFORD SQUARE, SECURITIES AND CASH RECEIVED FROM THE TRUSTEES, AND SURPLUS INCOME ACCOUNT.

COST

	£	s.	d.
British Oxygen Co., Ltd., £41 Ordinary Stock	143	10	0
£83 Ordinary Stock (allotted as Bonus)	0	0	0
Commonwealth of Australia, £700 2¾% Stock 1941/43	701	17	0
£1000 3¼% Stock 1964/74	990	2	0
£1000 3½% Stock 1954/59	1030	3	0
Carried forward	2865	12	0
Brought forward	2865	12	0
Conversion Loan, £1548 1s. 6d. 3½% Stock	1650	0	0
Local Loans, £1350 3% Stock	1311	6	9
	£5826	18	9

THE DAVID BERRY TRUST

The late David Anderson Berry, by his Will dated the 23 day of April 1926, left £1000 to provide in every third year a gold medal and prize money for the best essay on the Earl of Bothwell or, at the discretion of the Trustee, on Scottish History of the James Stuarts I to VI, in memory of his father, the late Rev. David Berry.

The Trust is now regulated by a Scheme sanctioned by the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice dated the 23rd day of January, 1930, and made in an Action 1927.A.1233 David Anderson Berry decd., Hunter and another v. Robertson and another.

This Society is now the Trustee, and the investments consist of £464 17*s.* 2*d.* 3½ per cent. Conversion Stock and £518 New Zealand 4½ per cent. Inscribed Stock 1945.

The Trustee will in every second year of the three-year period advertise in *The Times* inviting essays.

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE.

For the year ended October 31, 1936.

RECEIPTS.

Date			£	s.	d.
1935 Nov. 1.	Balance in hand brought forward from last account, viz.:				
	Cash at Bank . . .	£185 0 6			
	,, in Hand . . .	2 9 7	187	10	1
1936 March 4.	Cash and Dividend on Investments per Charity Commissioners		11	13	1
April 3.	,, ,, ,, ,,		11	2	2
Sept. 3.	,, ,, ,, ,,		11	13	1
Oct. 3.	,, ,, ,, ,,		11	2	2
			£233	0	7

PAYMENTS.

Date			£	s.	d.
1936 Jan. 20.	Printing		1	1	6
Oct. 31.	Postages			3	6
			1	5	0
Oct. 31.	Balance in hand carried forward, viz.:				
	Cash at Bank . . .	£229 9 6			
	,, in Hand . . .	2 6 1	231	15	7
			£233	0	7

We have examined the above account and find it correct. (*Signed*) A. E. STAMP, W. T. WHITLEY, J. HOLLAND WALKER } *Hon. Auditors.*

C. RYLAND BEEBY & Co., Chartered Accountants, 66, Basinghall Street, E.C.2.
December 3rd, 1936.

THE ALEXANDER TRUST

Mr. L. C. Alexander in 1897 gave Russian 4 per cent. Bonds for £100, the interest of which was to purchase a Silver Medal to be awarded yearly for the best essay of not more than 6,000 words. The Russian Bond is at present of no value. Since no interest has been paid the Society has voluntarily purchased the Medal out of the funds of the Society.

ALEXANDER PRIZE

The Alexander Prize was established in 1897 by L. C. Alexander, F.R.Hist.S. It consists of a Silver Medal awarded annually for an essay upon some historical subject. Candidates may select their own subject provided such subject has been previously submitted to and approved by the Literary Director. The essay must be a genuine work of original research, not hitherto published, and one which has not been awarded any other prize. It must not exceed 6,000 words in length and must be sent in on or before February 28th, 1938.

LIST OF ALEXANDER PRIZE ESSAYISTS (1898–1935) [1]

1898. F. Hermia Durham ("The Relations of the Crown to Trade under James I").
1899. W. F. Lord, B.A. ("The Development of Political Parties in the reign of Queen Anne").
1901. Laura M. Roberts ("The Peace of Lunéville").
1902. V. B. Redstone ("The Social Condition of England during the Wars of the Roses").
1903. Rose Graham ("The Intellectual Influence of English Monasticism between the tenth and twelfth centuries").
1904. Enid W. G. Routh ("The Balance of Power in the Seventeenth Century").
1905. W. A. P. Mason, M.A. ("The Beginnings of the Cistercian Order").
1906. Rachel R. Reid, M.A. ("The Rebellion of the Earls, 1569").
1908. Kate Hotblack ("The Peace of Paris, 1763").
1909. Nellie Nield, M.A. ("The Social and Economic Condition of the Unfree Classes in England in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries").

---

[1] No award was made in 1900, 1907, 1910, 1911, 1913, 1914, 1921. The prize Essays for 1909 and 1919 were not published in the *Transactions*. No Essays were submitted in 1915 and 1916.

1912. H. G. Richardson (" The Parish Clergy of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries ").

1917. Isobel D. Thornley, B.A. (" The Treason Legislation of 1531–1534 ").

1918. T. Plucknett, B.A. (" The Place of the Council in the Fifteenth Century ").

1919. Edna F. White, M.A. (" The Jurisdiction of the Privy Council under the Tudors ").

1920. J. E. Neale, M.A. (" The Commons Journals of the Tudor Period ").

1922. C. E. Martin (" The English Establishments on the Gold Coast in the Second Half of the Eighteenth Century ").

1923. E. W. Hensman, M.A. (" The Civil War of 1648 in the East Midlands ").

1924. Grace Stretton, B.A. (" Some Aspects of Mediæval Travel ").

1925. F. A. Mace, M.A. (" Devonshire Ports in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries ").

1926. Marian J. Tooley, M.A. (" The Authorship of the *Defensor Pacis* ").

1927. W. A. Pantin, B.A. (" Chapters of the English Black Monks, 1215–1540 ").

1928. Gladys A. Thornton, B.A., Ph.D. (" A Study in the History of Clare, Suffolk, with special reference to its development as a Borough ").

1929. F. S. Rodkey, A.M., Ph.D. (" Lord Palmerston's Policy for the Re-juvenation of Turkey, 1839–47 ").

1930. A. A. Ettinger, D.Phil. (" The Proposed Anglo-Franco-American Treaty of 1852 to guarantee Cuba to Spain ").

1931. Kathleen A. Walpole, M.A. (" The Humanitarian Movement of the Early Nineteenth Century to Remedy Abuses on Emigrant Vessels to America ").

1932. Dorothy M. Brodie, B.A. (" Edmund Dudley, Minister of Henry VII ").

1933. R. W. Southern, B.A. (" Ranulf Flambard and Early Anglo-Norman Administration ").

1934. S. B. Chrimes, M.A., Ph.D. (" Sir John Fortescue and his Theory of Dominion ").

1935. S. T. Bindoff, M.A. (" The Unreformed Diplomatic Service, 1812–60 ").

1936. Rosamond J. Mitchell, M.A., B.Litt. (" English Students at Padua, 1460–1475 ").

1937. C. H. Philips, B.A. (" The East India Company 'Interest,' and the English Government, 1783–4 ").

DAVID BERRY PRIZE

The David Berry Prize was established in 1929 by David Anderson-Berry in memory of his Father the Reverend David Berry. It consists of a Gold Medal and Money Prize awarded every three years for Scottish History. Candidates may select any subject dealing with Scottish History within the reigns of James I to James VI inclusive, provided such subject has been previously submitted to and approved by the Council of the Royal Historical Society. The Essay must be a genuine work of original research not hitherto published, and one which has not been awarded any other prize. There is no limit to the length of the Essay. It must be sent in on or before October 31st, 1940.

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

(INCORPORATED BY ROYAL CHARTER.)

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL—1936-37.

Patron.

HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

President.

Professor F. M. Stenton, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A.

Honorary Vice-Presidents.

Professor Sir Raymond Beazley, J.P., M.A., D.Litt.
Sir Reginald Blomfield, R.A., M.A., D.Litt., F.S.A.
J. F. Chance, M.A.
The Right Hon. Winston S. Churchill, C.H., M.P.
The Right Hon. Lord Ernle, M.V.O., M.A. (died July, 1937).
The Very Rev. the Dean of Gloucester, D.D., Litt.D., F.S.A.
G. P. Gooch, D.Litt., Litt.D., F.B.A.
Professor A. J. Grant, M.A., Litt.D.
The Right Hon. the Earl of Ilchester.
Professor Sir John Lloyd, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A.
Professor Sir Charles Oman, M.P., LL.D., D.C.L., F.B.A., F.S.A.
A. F. Pollard, D.Lit., Litt.D., F.B.A.
The Right Hon. Sir Frederick Pollock, Bt., K.C., D.C.L., LL.D. F.B.A. (died January, 1937).
R. L. Poole, LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A.
R. A. Roberts.
Professor G. M. Trevelyan, O.M., Litt.D., F.B.A.
The Rev. Professor J. P. Whitney, D.D., D.C.L.
Professor G. M. Wrong, M.A., LL.D.

Vice-Presidents.

Professor H. W. V. Temperley, O.B.E., Litt.D., F.B.A.
Rev. Canon Claude Jenkins, D.D., F.S.A.
Charles Johnson, M.A., F.B.A., F.S.A.
Miss Rose Graham, M.A., D.Litt., F.S.A.
Professor A. P. Newton, M.A., D.Lit., F.S.A.
Professor J. H. Clapham, C.B.E., Litt.D., F.B.A.
A. G. Little, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A.
Professor F. M. Powicke, M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A.

Council.

Herbert Wood, B.A., F.S.A.
Miss I. J. Churchill, D.Phil., F.S.A.
Professor G. S. Veitch, M.A., Litt.D.
C. S. B. Buckland, M.A., D.Litt.
Professor D. C. Douglas, M.A.
A. V. Judges, B.A.
Professor William Rees, M.A., D.Sc.
A. Aspinall, M.A., Ph.D.
Miss H. M. Cam, M.A.
R. R. Darlington, B.A., Ph.D.
R. Pares, M.A.
C. T. Clay, M.A., F.S.A.
V. H. Galbraith, M.A.
Professor Lillian Penson, Ph.D.
L. E. Tanner, M.V.O., M.A., F.S.A.
Professor A. Hamilton Thompson, D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A.

Honorary Secretary.

Professor H. Hale Bellot, M.A.

Director.

Hubert Hall, Litt.D., F.S.A.

Honorary Treasurer.

M. S. Giuseppi, I.S.O., F.S.A.

Assistant Secretary and Librarian.

Miss M. B. Curran, M.A.

Assistant Officer and Junior Librarian.

A. T. Milne, M.A.

Library and Offices.

96 Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, S.W.10.

Bankers.

Barclays Limited.

STANDING COMMITTEES—1936-37.

Finance Committee.

A. H. Cheney.
C. Johnson, M.A., F.B.A., F.S.A.
A. V. Judges, B.A.
L. C. Loyd, B.A.
Herbert Wood, B.A., F.S.A.
Professor F. M. Stenton, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., *President.*
Hubert Hall, Litt.D., F.S.A., *Director.*
M. S. Giuseppi, I.S.O., F.S.A., *Hon. Treasurer.*
Professor H. Hale Bellot, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

Library Committee.

C. S. B. Buckland, M.A., D.Litt.
C. T. Clay, M.A., F.S.A.
C. Johnson, M.A., F.B.A., F.S.A.
C. G. Parsloe, B.A.
Professor F. M. Stenton, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., *President.*
Hubert Hall, Litt.D., F.S.A., *Director.*
M. S. Giuseppi, I.S.O., F.S.A., *Hon. Treasurer.*
Professor H. Hale Bellot, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

Publication Committee.

Miss H. M. Cam, M.A.
Professor D. C. Douglas, M.A.
A. V. Judges, B.A.
Professor Lillian Penson, B.A., Ph.D.
Professor William Rees, M.A., D.Sc.
Professor F. M. Powicke, M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A.
Professor C. K. Webster, M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A.
Professor C. H. Williams, M.A.
Professor F. M. Stenton, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., *President.*
Hubert Hall, Litt.D., F.S.A., *Director.*
M. S. Giuseppi, I.S.O., F.S.A., *Hon. Treasurer.*
Professor H. Hale Bellot, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

Bibliography (Annual) Committee.

R. R. Darlington, B.A., Ph.D.
A. V. Judges, B.A.
Professor Lillian Penson, B.A., Ph.D.
Professor William Rees, M.A., D.Sc.
Professor F. M. Stenton, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., *President.*
Hubert Hall, Litt.D., F.S.A., *Director.*
M. S. Giuseppi, I.S.O., F.S.A., *Hon. Treasurer.*
Professor H. Hale Bellot, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

LIST OF FELLOWS OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Names of Officers and Members of Council are printed in SMALL CAPITALS.
*Those marked * have compounded for their Annual Subscriptions.*

* Abbott, Rev. H. A., M.A., L.C.P., Palmer's School, Grays, Essex.
Adair, E. R., M.A., McGill University, Montreal, Canada.
Adler, E. N., 20 Porchester Square, W.2.
Ady, Miss C. M., M.A., 40 St. Margaret's Road, Oxford.
Ahmad, Mohammad Basheer, M.A., I.C.S., Judge's House, Rai Bareli., U.P., India.
Ainley, Rev. B. S., B.A., Norwell Vicarage, Newark-on-Trent.
Albion, Rev. Gordon, D.Sc. (Louvain), St. John's Seminary, Wonersh, Guildford.
Allen, B. M., M.A., 345 St. Ermin's, Westminster, S.W.1.
Allen, Miss H. E., A.B., A.M., Kenwood, Oneida, N.Y., U.S.A.
Altamira y Crevea, Professor R., Lagasca 105, Madrid, Spain.
Anderson, A. K., M.A., The Scots College, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.
Anderson, Professor F. M., M.A., Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H., U S.A.
* Anderson, R. C., M.A., Basset Holt, Southampton.
* Andrews, F. B., F.S.A., F.R.I.B.A., 29 Greenhill Road, Moseley, Birmingham.
Andrews, Rev. P. J., 63 Tufton Street, S.W.1.
Armstrong, C. A. J., B.A., Hertford College, Oxford.
Artz, Professor F. B., Ph.D., 131 Forest Street, Oberlin, Ohio, U.S.A.
Arundale, The Right Rev. G. S., M.A., LL.B., D.L., 10 Buckingham Street, Buckingham Gate, S.W.1.
Ashdown, Mrs. Charles H., The Green, Kirby Moorside, Yorks.
* ASPINALL, A., M.A., Ph.D., 33 Grosvenor Road, Caversham, nr. Reading.
Atiya, Aziz Suryal, M.A., Ph.D., 7 Lemon Grove, Sefton Park, Liverpool.
Atkinson, C. T., M.A., Exeter College, Oxford.
Atkinson, Professor D., M.A., F.S.A., 28 Queens Road, West Didsbury, Manchester.
Attlee, Rev. B. H. B., D.D., St. Cross Vicarage, Holywell, Oxford.
* Auden, Miss Henrietta M., Alderdene, Church Stretton, Salop.

Bagshawe, T. W., F.S.A., Hill Wood, Dagnall, nr. Berkhamsted.
Baker, Lieut.-Colonel B. G., J.P., D.S.O., F.R.G.S., St. Mary's Road, Beccles, Suffolk.
Baker, G. P., 50 Great Russell Street, W.C.1.
Baldwin, Professor J. F., Ph.D., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y., U.S.A.
Bales, P. G., M.C., M.A., 4 Bass Terrace, Thorne Road, Doncaster.
Balfour-Melville, E. W. M., M.A., 2 South Learmonth Gardens, Edinburgh.

Balkrishna, Professor, M.A., Ph.D., Rajaram College, Kolhapur, India.
Banks, Mrs. M. M., 16 Hornton Court, Hornton Street, W.8.
Barnard, E. A. B., M.A., F.S.A., 26 Warkworth Street, Cambridge.
Barnes, Professor D. G., M.A., Ph.D., Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, U.S.A.
Barnes, Professor Viola F., M.A., Ph.D., Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass., U.S.A.
Baskerville, G., M.A., Crowsley Park, Henley-on-Thames.
Bate, G. E., 55 Harvard Road, Spring Grove, Isleworth, Middlesex.
* Bayley, A. R., B.A., Cotford, Graham Road, Great Malvern.
Bazeley, Miss M. L., M.A., B.D., 113 North Side, S.W.4.
Beardwood, Miss Alice, B.A., B.Litt., D.Phil., 415 Miller's Lane, Penn Valley, Narberth P.O., Penna, U.S.A.
BEAZLEY, Professor Sir RAYMOND, J.P., D.Litt., 6 Arthur Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham.
Beer, E. S. de, M.A., 11 Sussex Place, N.W.1.
* Beet, Rev. W. E., M.A., D.Litt., Charisma, Castle Road, Saltwood, Hythe.
Begley, W. W., 30 Rylandes Road, Croham Heights, Selsdon, Surrey
Behrens, Miss C. B. A., B.A., Bailey Hill, Denham, Bucks.
* Bell, Lieut.-Commander A. C., R.N., Bushypark House, Ennis, Co. Clare.
Bell, Professor Herbert C., Ph.D., 22 Wyllys Avenue, Middletown, Conn., U.S.A.
Beller, E. A., D.Phil., 15 Alexander Street, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A.
BELLOT, Professor H. H., M.A. (*Hon. Secretary*), 9 Well Walk, N.W.3.
Benham, Sir W. Gurney, F.S.A., Westfield, 14, Lexden Road, Colchester.
Benjamin, Professor G. G., M.A., Ph.D., University of South California, University Park, Los Angeles, Cal., U.S.A.
Benns, Professor F. Lee, Ph.D., 320 North Jordan Avenue, Bloomington, Indiana, U.S.A.
Bentliff, E. D., M.A., 34 Princes Avenue, Great Crosby, nr. Liverpool.
Bère, Professor R. de la., M.A., R.A.F. College, Cranwell, Lincs.
Berkeley, G. F. H., J.P., B.A., Hanwell Castle, Banbury.
Betts, Professor R. R., B.A., University College, Southampton.
Beveridge, Sir William H., K.C.B., LL.D., B.C.L., F.B.A., The Masters' Lodgings, University College, Oxford.
Billingham, P. H., B.A., B.Litt., Ardenoak, Solihull, Warwickshire.
Bing, H. F., M.A., The Folk House, College Green, Bristol, 1.
* Binns, Rev. L. Elliott, M.A., D.D., Brook House, Cambridge.
Birch, F. L., M.A., 11 Montpelier Row, S.W.7.
Black, Professor J. B., M.A., The University, Aberdeen.
Blake, A. H., M.A., Authors' Club, 2 Whitehall Court, S.W.1.
* Blakey, Professor R. G., Ph.D., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., U.S.A.
* BLOMFIELD, Sir REGINALD, R.A., M.A., Litt.D., D.Litt., F.S.A., 51 Frognal, N.W.3.
Boak, Professor E. R., Ph.D., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., U.S.A.
Boase, T. S. R., M.A., Hertford College, Oxford.
Bolam, Rev. Canon C. E., Willoughby Rectory, Alford, Lincs.

Bond, Professor B. W., Ph.D., University of Cincinnati, McMicken Hall, Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.A.
Bourdillon, Miss A. F. C., M.A., Barnett House, Oxford.
Bourne, Professor H. E., B.D., LL.D., L.H.D., 2504 Derbyshire Road, Cleveland Heights, Ohio., U.S.A.
Boyd, Allen R., Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
Bracey, The Very Rev. R., St. Dominic's Priory, Carisbrooke, Isle of Wight.
Bradyll-Johnson, Rev. L., M.A., D.D., 6 Park Lane, Milford on Sea, Hants.
* Brebner, Professor J. B., M.A., B.Litt., Ph.D., Columbia University, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.
Brendon, J. A., B.A., England's Side, Queen Camel, Somerset.
Bridge, J. S. C., Cookley House, Henley-on-Thames.
Brinton, Crane, B.A., D.Phil., J24 Dunster House, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
Brodie, Miss D. M., B.A., Ph.D., Newnham College, Cambridge.
Brogan, D. W., M.A., Kybald Twychen, Kybald Street, Oxford.
Brooke, Z. N., M.A., Litt.D., Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.
Brooks, F. W., M.A., University College, Hull.
Broome, Miss D. M., Ph.D., 37 Ashburn Road, Stockport.
*Brown, A. E., M.A., LL.B., Brooklyn, Cherry Hinton Road, Cambridge.
Brown, B. Goulding, M.A., 16 Brookside, Cambridge.
Brown, Rev. G. K., B.A., Ph.D., D.Litt., 64 Brantfell Road, Blackburn.
Brown, Professor Louise F., Ph.D., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y., U.S.A.
Brown, W. E., M.A., B.Sc., 53 South Park Avenue, Glasgow.
Browning, Professor Andrew, M.A., Westdel, Queen's Place, Glasgow, W.2.
Bryant, A. W. M., M.A., The White House, East Claydon, Bucks.
BUCKLAND, C. S. B., M.A., D.Litt., 16 Downside Crescent, N.W.3.
Buckland, Professor W. W., LL.D., D.C.L., F.B.A., 9 Grange Road, Cambridge.
Buckler, Professor F. W., M.A., The Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio, U.S.A.
Buick, T. L., J.P., C.M.G., 5 Boston Terrace, Wellington, New Zealand.
Bullock, Major Humphry, Headquarters Northern Command, Rawalpindi, India.
Burleigh, Rev. Professor J. H. S., B.D., The University, Edinburgh, 10.
Burman, J., Greenfields, Hampton Lane, Solihull, Warwickshire.
Bury, J. P. T., M.A., Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.
* Busher, Rev. T. Story, D.D., M.A., The Rectory, Charlton-on-Otmoor, Oxford.
Bushnell, G. H., M.R.A.S., F.S.P., University Library, St. Andrews, Fife.
Butchers, A. G., M.A., LL.B., Litt.D., 18 Wilford Street, Lower Hutt, Wellington, New Zealand.
Butler, H. M., M.A., Queen Mary's School, Walsall.
Butler, J. R. M., M.V.O., O.B.E., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Butler, Wilson, M.A., LL.M., Glebelands, Broughton-in Furness.
Butt-Thompson, Captain F. W., 43, Danecourt Road, Parkstone, Dorset.

Butterfield, Mrs., M.A., Congreve Park, Spanish Town, P.O., Jamaica, B.W.I.

* Callender, Professor G. A. R., M.A., F.S.A., Royal Maritime Museum, Greenwich, S.E.10.
Calthrop, Miss M. M. C., 26 Maitland Park Road, N.W.3.
* CAM, Miss H. M., M.A., Girton College, Cambridge.
Cameron, Miss A. I., M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt., 25 Thorburn Road, Colinton, Edinburgh, 13.
Cameron, Miss J., B.A., 806 Grenville House, Dolphin Square, S.W.1.
Cammaerts, Professor Emile, Quadrant House, Pall Mall, S.W.1.
* Campbell, Miss A. M., A.M., Ph.D., New Jersey College for Women, New Brunswick, N.J., U.S.A.
Campbell, Miss Sybil, M.A., 2 Brick Court, Temple, E.C.4.
Cape, H. J., M.A., B.Sc., The Old Rectory, Markshall, near Coggeshall, Essex.
* Carlyle, E. I., M.A., Lincoln College, Oxford.
Carrier, Miss E. H., M.A., M.Sc., Avery Hill College, Eltham, S.E.9.
Carruthers, Mrs. C. H., 8 Gower Street, W.C.1.
Carter, Professor C. E., Ph.D., Department of State, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
* Carter, Rev. C. S., D.D., Clifton Theological College, Stoke Bishop, Bristol.
Cartlidge, Rev. S. E. G., The Vicarage, Oakengates, Salop.
* Cecil, Algernon, M.A., 43 Bryanston Square, W.1.
Chacko, C. J., M.A., Ph.D., Ewing Hall, Forman Christian College, Lahore, Punjab, India.
Chamberlin, Frederick, LL.B., F.S.A., 22 Alleyn Road, S.E.21.
Chambers, Miss A. M., Girls' Grammar School, Hitchin.
* CHANCE, J. F., M.A., 30 Lennox Gardens, S.W.1.
Chandler, P. W., F.S.A., Frognal Dene, N.W.3.
Chapin, H. M., A.B., 93 Brown Street, Providence, R.I., U.S.A.
* Charleston, Lektor S. J., M.A., Handelshögskolan, Sveavägen, 65, Stockholm, Sweden.
Charnwood, Lord, M.A., D.L., 108 Eaton Square, S.W.1.
* Chart, D. A., I.S.O., Litt.D., 35 Sans Souci Park, Belfast.
Cheney, C. R., M.A., Wadham College, Oxford.
Chew, Miss H. M., M.A., Ph.D., 115 Erskine Hill, N.W.11.
Chitty, Herbert, M.A., F.S.A., 26 Ladbroke Square, W.11.
Chrimes, S. B., M.A., Ph.D., The University, Glasgow.
* Christie, Mrs., Gatlands, Ditchling, Sussex.
Church, Rev. L. F., B.A., Ph.D., Helvellyn, 63 Higher Drive, Banstead, Surrey.
Churchill, E. F., M.A., D.Lit., West Ham Municipal Secondary School, Tennyson Road, E.15.
CHURCHILL, Miss I. J., D.Phil., F.S.A., 22 May's Hill Road, Shortlands, Kent.
CHURCHILL, The Right Hon. WINSTON S., C.H., M.P., Chartwell, Westerham, Kent.
CLAPHAM, Professor J. H., C.B.E., Litt.D., F.B.A., King's College, Cambridge.

Clark, A. E., M.A., 304 Birmingham Road, Walsall.
Clark, C. Upson, Ph.D., Yale Club, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.
Clark, Professor G. N., M.A., All Souls College, Oxford.
Clark, G. S. R. Kitson, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Clark, Rev. Henry W., D.D., St. John's School, Broxbourne, Herts.
Clarke, Professor F., M.A., 1 Upton Leeze, London Road, S.E.23.
CLAY, C. T., M.A., F.S.A., 11 Tite Street, S.W.3.
Clayton, J., Littleworth, Campden, Glos.
Clegg, Mrs., B.A., Branscombe, Avondale Road, Heavitree, Exeter.
Clements, E. E., Greenways, Fairfield Park, Bath.
Cleve, Professor T. C. Van, M.A., Ph.D., Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine, U.S.A.
Coate, Miss M., M.A., Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.
Cobb, Sir Cyril Stephen, B.C.L., M.A., F.R.G.S., 5 Cornwall Terrace, N.W.1.
* Cockburn, J. H., O.B.E., Danes Hill, Rotherham.
Cockle, M. J. D., Wheatfen Broad, Surlingham, Norwich.
* Code, Rev. J. B., M.A., S.T.B., Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
Colby, Professor C. W., M.A., Ph.D., 1240 Pine Avenue West, Montreal, Canada.
Collingwood, Professor R. G., M.A., F.B.A., F.S.A., 15 Belbroughton Road, Oxford.
Collins, Professor Ross W., M.A., B.D., Ph.D., University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.
Cooper, W., F.S.A., Lulworth Court, Leamington Spa.
Coopland, Professor G. W., M.A., Litt.D., 6 Bark Hill Road, Aigburth, Liverpool.
Cope, J. H., Finchampstead Place, Wokingham, Berks.
* Cornelius, Rev. W. J. J., B.D., D.Litt., The Vicarage, Peacehaven, Sussex.
Corson, J. C., M.A., Ph.D., 11 Eyre Crescent, Edinburgh, 5.
Coupland, Professor R., M.A., Wootton Hill, near Oxford.
* Crawley, C. W., M.A., Trinity Hall, Cambridge.
Cronne, H. A., M.A., 101 Fellows Road, N.W.3.
Cross, Professor A. L., Ph.D., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., U.S.A.
Cruttwell, C. R., M.A., Hertford College, Oxford.
Cundall, F., O.B.E., F.S.A., Barnsil, Kingston, Jamaica, W. Indies.
Cunningham, Miss A., M.A., 2 St. Paul's Road, Cambridge.
Curtis, C. D., Sundial House, 111 Queen's Road, Brighton, 1.

DARLINGTON, R. R., B.A., Ph.D., Bedford College, Regent's Park, N.W.1.
* Darwin, F. D. S., M.A., 86A Banbury Road, Oxford.
Das. Harihar, B.Litt., Sidhipasa, Jessore, Khulna, Bengal, India.
David, Professor C. W., Ph.D., Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa., U.S.A.
Davies, C. C., M.A., Ph.D., 100 Divinity Road, Oxford.
* Davies, G., M.A., Huntington Library, San Marino, Cal., U.S.A.
Davies, Miss A. F., M.A., 8 Belbroughton Road, Oxford.
Davies, Rev. R. T., M.A., 9 Manor Road, Holywell, Oxford.

Davies, W. S., M.A., Hartlebury, Overland Road, Mumbles, Swansea.
Davies, W. T., B.A., Glanwern, Clasemont, Morriston, Swansea.
* Davis, Miss E. Jeffries, M.A., F.S.A., University College, Gower Street, W.C.1.
Dawes, M. C. B., B.A., F.S.A., 18 Ormonde Mansions, 106 Southampton Row, W.C.1.
Dawson, Christopher, M.A., Hartlington Hall, Skipton, Yorks.
* Day, P. W., M.A., 2 Rectory Terrace, Gosforth, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Day, W. I. Leeson, Cawsend, Holsworthy, Devon.
Deanesly, Miss M., M.A., 197 Clarence Gate Gardens, N.W.1.
Denholm-Young, N., M.A., Magdalen College, Oxford.
Dennett, J., York Lodge, Beverley, E. Yorks.
* Denny, L. R. R., M.A., 28 St. Andrew's Terrace, Strowan, Christchurch, New Zealand.
Dewar, Captain A. C., O.B.E., B.Litt., R.N., Junior Army and Navy Club, Horseguards' Avenue, Whitehall, S.W.1.
Dickie, Professor A. C., M.A., F.S.A., Long Crendon, Bucks.
Dilks, T. B., B.A., East Gate, Bridgwater.
Dobrée, Professor Bonamy, O.B.E., M.A., The University, Leeds.
Dodd, Professor A. H., M.A., 12 Menai View Terrace, Upper Bangor.
Dodwell, Professor H. H., M.A., School of Oriental Studies, Vandon House, Vandon Street, S.W.1.
Doncaster, J. H., M.A., Wag Wood, Dore, Sheffield.
Dorling, Captain H. T., R.N. (retd.), D.S.O., Marlings, Pembroke Road, Woking.
Dormer, E. W., 15 Church Road, Earley, Reading.
Doubleday, H. A., 2 Dungarvan Avenue, S.W.15.
DOUGLAS, Professor D. C., M.A., University College, Exeter.
Douie, Miss D. L., B.A., Ph.D., 13 South Bailey, Durham.
Dow, Professor E. W., Ph.D., 554 Thompson Street, Ann Arbor, Mich., U.S.A.
Dudden, Rev. Canon F. H., M.A., D.D., The Master's Lodgings, Pembroke College, Oxford.
Duncalf, Professor F. I., Ph.D., University of Texas, Austin, Texas, U.S.A.
Duncan, Professor D. Shaw, Ph.D., LL.D., 2255 South Columbine Street, Denver, Col., U.S.A.
* Durham, The Right Rev. the Bishop of, D.D., F.S.A., Auckland Castle, Bishop Auckland.
Dyer, Miss F. E., 116 Jerningham Road, S.E.14.
Dykes, Professor D. O., K.C., M.A., LL.B., 16 South Charlotte Street, Edinburgh.

Edmond, Miss D., B.Sc., 45 Hepworth Road, S.W.16.
Edwards, Miss I. E., M.A., 4 Uplands Buildings, Swansea.
Edwards, J. G., M.A., Jesus College, Oxford.
Edwards, N. F., 147 Queen's Court, Queen's Road, W.2.
Edwards, R. W. D., M.A., Ph.D., 25 Seafield Avenue, Clontarf, Dublin.
Edwards, Major T. J., Room 123, The War Office, Whitehall, S.W.1.
Elliott, C. A., M.A., The Cloisters, Eton College, Windsor.
*Elliott, T. C., A.B., Walla Walla, Washington, U.S.A. (P.O. Box 775).

Ellis, A. C., M.A., St. Albans, Chelston, Torquay.
Ellis, C., M.A., 14 Dudley Road, S.W.19.
Ellis, Miss M. F. H., Little Dean, Glos.
Emden, C. S., M.A., Oriel College, Oxford.
* Ettinger, A. A., M.A., D.Phil., Litt.D., 1114 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa., U.S.A.
Evans, Miss A. M., M.A., Normal College, Bangor.
Evans, D. L., B.A., B.Litt., Public Record Office, Chancery Lane, W.C.2.
Evans, Miss E., M.A., B.Litt., Somerville College, Oxford.
Evans, Miss Joan, D.Lit., F.S.A., 9 Kensington Park Gardens, W.11.
Evans, Rev. J. H., B.A., Croxton Kerrial Vicarage, Grantham.
Evans, T., M.A., County School, Cardigan.
Evennett, H. O., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
* Ezard, Edward Henry, M.A., M.D., Clare Cottage, Castle Street, Cambridge.

Fagan, Sir Patrick, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., 73 Canfield Gardens, N.W.6.
* Farquhar, Miss Helen, 6 Lowndes Street, S.W.1.
Farran, Professor A. C., M.A., Kharnatak College, Dharwar, India.
* Fawcett, Sir Charles, I.C.S. (retired), 27 The Grove, Boltons, S.W.10.
* Fay, C. R., M.A., Christ's College, Cambridge.
Fay, Professor S. B., Ph.D., 194 Brattle Street, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
Feavearyear, A. E., D.Sc., 48 Cheviot Road, S.E.27.
Fenwick, Miss Susan F., 64 Kensington Park Road, W.11.
Ferris, C. E., Dunelm School, c/o Messrs. MacGibbon, Mason & Co., Hereford Street (City), Christchurch, New Zealand.
* Fiddes, Professor E., M.A., LL.D., 173 Wilmslow Road, Withington, Manchester.
* Fletcher, Rev. A. W., M.A., LL.B., Repton Vicarage, Derby.
Fletcher, Rev. Canon J. M. J., M.A., 59 The Close, Salisbury.
Flower, R. E. W., B.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., 14 Wellesley Grove, Croydon, Surrey.
* Ford, Worthington C., Ph.D., c/o Morgan & Co., 14 Place Vendôme, Paris, France.
Formoy, Mrs. B. E. H., M.A., 12 Middleway, N.W.11.
* Fountaine, Mrs. R. W., Pollicott, Thame, Oxon.
Fowler, G. H., C.B.E., B.A., Ph.D., The Old House, Aspley Guise, Beds.
Frampton, R., B.A., Oaklands, 15 Richmond Hill Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham.
* Free, Rev. Richard W., M.A., B.D., 132 Westminster Drive, Westcliff.
* Freeman, Arnold, M.A., B.Litt., Sheffield Education Settlement, Shipton Street, Sheffield.
Freeman, J. J., C.B.E., Shepperton-on-Thames.
French, Colonel C. N., C.M.G., C.B.E., 19 Knightsbridge, S.W.1.
* Fryer, Professor C. E., M.A., Ph.D., McGill University, Montreal, Canada.
Furber, H., M.A., Ph.D., E 11 Lowell House, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
Fussell, G. E., 3 Primrose House, Albert Terrace, N.W.1.

Galbraith, Professor V. H., M.A., 12 Learmouth Gardens, Edinburgh, 4.
Garrett, Professor H. L. O., M.A., I.E.S., c/o Messrs. Grindley & Co., 54 Parliament Street, S.W.1.

Garside, B., M.A., Whitecross, Wensleydale Road, Hampton-on-Thames.
Gay, Professor E. F., Ph.D., LL.D., Litt.D., c/o Huntington Library, San Marino, Cal., U.S.A.
GEE, The Very Rev. HENRY, D.D., Litt.D., F.S.A., The Deanery, Gloucester.
George, Mrs., M.A., Litt.D., 51 Paulton's Square, S.W.3.
George, R. H., A.M., Ph.D., Brown University, Providence, R.I., U.S.A.
Geyl, Professor Pieter, Litt.D., Willem Barentzstraat 5, Utrecht, Holland.
Gibson, Strickland, M.A., 34 Hill Top Road, Oxford.
* Ghatak, Professor Jyotish Chandra, M.A., 4 Boloram Bose Ghat Road, Bhowanipur, Calcutta, India.
Gill, Professor C., M.A., Litt.D., Chestnut Lodge, Cottingham, E. Yorks.
Gipson, Professor L. H., Ph.D., Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa., U.S.A.
* GIUSEPPI, M. S., I.S.O., F.S.A. (*Hon. Treasurer*), 72 Burlington Avenue, Kew Gardens, Surrey.
Glendon, E. T., M.A., Burwell, Cambs.
Gnana Viran, S. S., 70 Phayre Street, Rangoon, Burma.
Godley, The Hon. Eveline, Durrant's Court, High Halden, Kent.
Goldthorp, L. M., M.A., Fulneck Boys' School, nr. Leeds.
* GOOCH, G. P., M.A., Litt.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., 76 Campden Hill Road, W.8.
Goodman, Mrs. A. W., Dormy Cottage, 49 S. Cross Road, Winchester.
Goodman, Rev. Canon A. W., M.A., B.D., F.S.A., Dormy Cottage, 49 S. Cross Road, Winchester.
Goodman, Paul, 10 The Ridgeway, N.W.11.
Goodwin, A., M.A., Jesus College, Oxford.
Gotch, J. A., M.A., F.S.A., Weekley Rise, Kettering.
Grace, Miss M., M.A., The Laurels, Newick, Lewes.
Grace, W. F. F., M.A., Ph.D., Thornfield, Huyton, nr. Liverpool.
Graham, G. S., M.A., Ph.D., Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada.
* GRAHAM, Miss ROSE, M.A., D.Litt., F.S.A., 12 Ladbroke Gardens, W.11.
Graham, Rev. W., M.A., L.Th., 30 Clarendon Square, Leamington Spa.
Graham-Dow, Mrs., M.A., Ph.D., 8 Queen Margaret Road, Glasgow, N.W.1.
GRANT, Professor A. J., M.A., Litt.D., 17 Gurney Drive, N.2.
Graves, Miss F. M., 10 Barton Street, S.W.1.
Greaves, J. W., M.A., Sydney High School, Moore Park, Sydney, Australia.
Green, D. Walford, M.A., Courtenwell, Langton, near Tunbridge Wells.
Green, H., B.A., St. Michael's, Brands Hill Avenue, High Wycombe, Bucks.
* Greene, C. H., M.A., Incents, Beacon Road, Crowborough, Sussex.
Gregory, M. V., M.A., Dorny, Adamthwaite Drive, Blythe Bridge, Stoke-on-Trent.
Grew, Mrs. M. E., 47 Oakley Street, S.W.3.
Grierson, P., M.A., Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.
Grime, Rev. A., M.A., Ph.D., Lyndhurst, 63 Rawson Street, Farnworth, Bolton.
* Grimes, Rev. C. H. D., M.A., Jaurès Gasse 10, Vienna, III Austria.
* Griscom, Rev. Acton, M.A., 25 Sixth Street, North Pelham, N.Y., U.S.A.

Guedalla, Philip, M.A., 5 Hyde Park Street, W.2.
Guilday, Rev. Monsignor Peter, Ph.D., LL.D., Catholic University of America, Brookland, D.C., U.S.A.
Gumbley, Rev. W., O.P., Blackfriars, Oxford.
* Gun, W. T. J., B.A., 55 Wetherby Mansions, S.W.5.
Gupta, S. N. Das, M.A., Lucknow University, Lucknow, U.P., India.
Gwynn, D. R., B.A., D.Litt., 3 Queen's Terrace, Windsor.

Haig, Lieut.-Colonel Sir T. Wolseley, 34 Gledstanes Road, W.14.
* Hall, C. S., M.A., Heathfield, 3 Queen's Road, Bradford, Yorks.
HALL, HUBERT, Litt.D., F.S.A. (*Director*), 26 Old Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.2.
Hall, I. V., M.A., 148 Fishponds Road, Bristol.
Hall, D. G. E., M.A., D.Lit., Caterham School, Surrey.
* Hall, T. W., M.A., F.S.A., 6 Gladstone Road, Sheffield.
Halliday, W. R., M.A., LL.D., King's College, Strand, W.C.2.
Hampson, Miss E. M., M.A., Ph.D., Newnham College, Cambridge.
Hancock, The Ven. Archdeacon L. R., M.A., The Rectory, Whatley, Frome, Som.
Hancock, Professor W. K., M.A., The University, Edmund Street, Birmingham.
Hannay, Professor R. K., M.A., LL.D., 5 Royal Terrace, Edinburgh.
Harding, W. G., F.S.A., Peckwater House, Charing, Kent.
Harley, J. H., M.A., 59 Parliament Hill, N.W.3.
Harlow, V. T., M.A., D.Litt., The Firs, Old Marston, Oxford.
* Harris, Sir Charles A., K.C.M.G., C.B., C.V.O., Greenhill Brow, Farnham, Surrey.
Harrison, G. B., M.A., Ph.D., Birchanger, nr. Bishops Stortford.
Hartopp, Henry, 81 Barclay Street, Narborough Road, Leicester.
Harvey, Professor E. L., M.A., c/o Thos. Cook & Son, Hong-Kong, China.
Hasluck, E. L., B.A., Heathfield, Western Avenue, Herne Bay.
Hattersley, Professor A. F., M.A., 10 The Avenue, Filey, Yorks.
* Havinden, Eric, M.A., 30 Park Avenue, Solihull, Warwickshire.
Hayden, Professor Mary T., M.A., 26 Cambridge Road, Upper Rathmines, Dublin.
Hazeltine, Professor H. D., M.A., F.B.A., West Lodge, Downing College, Cambridge.
Hazen, Professor C. D., Ph.D., Columbia University, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.
* Hearnshaw, Professor F. J. C., M.A., LL.D., Litt.D., Hammerwood, Oxted, Surrey.
Heathcote, C. W., A.M., Ph.D., State Normal School, 215 South Walnut Street, West Chester, Pa., U.S.A.
Heatley, D. P., M.A., 28 Minto Street, Edinburgh.
Heaton, Professor H., M.A., D.Litt., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., U.S.A.
Hemmant, Miss M., B.A., Ph.D., The Lodge, Sevenoaks.
Henderson, Professor G. D., D.D., D.Litt., The University, Aberdeen.
Henderson, J. M., M.A., King's College, Aberdeen.
Hepburn, E., 111 Main Road, Sidcup, Kent.
* Higham, C. S. S., M.A., 16 Leopold Road, S.W.19.

Hill, J. W. F., M.A., LL.M., 2 Lindum Terrace, Lincoln.
Hill, Lady, Green Place, Stockbridge, Hants.
Hine, R. L., F.S.A., Willian Bury, Willian, Herts.
Hodges, H. W., M.A., Royal Naval College, Dartmouth.
* Hodgkin, R. H., M.A., The Queen's College, Oxford.
Hoggarth, A. H. G., M.A., Churcher's College, Petersfield.
* Hollingsworth, L. W., B.A., Education Dept., Zanzibar, E. Africa.
Holt, Miss A. D., 47 Bramham Gardens, S.W.5.
Hood, Mrs. Ivo, Sidestrand, Cromer.
* Horn, D. B., M.A., D.Litt., Ettrick, Pentland Avenue, Colinton, Edinburgh.
Horne, Rev. W., The Vicarage, Lower Darwen, Lancs.
Horváth, Professor Eugene, Phil.D., II, Ilona útca 4, Francis Joseph Institute, Budapest, Hungary.
Hoskins, H. L., Ph.D., Tufts College, Medford, Mass., U.S.A.
Hoult, James, F.S.A. (Scot.), 12 Brookland Road, Stoneycroft, Liverpool.
Houseman, J. W., M.A., The Grammar School, Hipperholme, Yorks.
* Howard-Watson, Captain J. A., F.R.G.S., F.R.S.L., Bella Vista, Nicholas Road, Blundellsands, near Liverpool.
Howay, His Honour F. W., LL.D., Law Courts, New Westminster, British Columbia, Canada.
Howden, Miss M. P., M.A., 17c Huskisson Street, Liverpool.
Hoyland, J. S., M.A., Holland House, Woodbrooke, Selly Oak, Birmingham.
Hudson, G. F., M.A., All Souls College, Oxford.
Hull, Professor W. I., Ph.D., Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa., U.S.A.
Hulme, H., Ph.D., New York University, Washington Square East, New York City, U.S.A.
Hunt, R. N. Carew, B.A., B.Litt., 3c Carlisle Place, S.W.1.
Hurnand, Miss N. D., M.A., D.Phil., 49 Woodstock Road, Oxford.
* Hyamson, A. M., 32 Teignmouth Road, N.W.2.
Hyde, F. E., M.A., Ph.D., The University, Liverpool.
Hyde, H. M., M.A., 32 Roland Gardens, S.W.7.
* Hyde, J. H., B.A., 18 Rue Adolphe Yvon, Paris, XVI^e, France.
Hyslop, R., F.S.A. (Scot.), Field House, Hylton, Sunderland.

* ILCHESTER, The Right Hon. the Earl of, Holland House, Kensington, W.8.
Irwin, Miss M. G., M.A., 7 The Butts, Harrow-on-the-Hill.
Ivamy, E., M.A., Redesdale, The Park, Cheltenham.

Jackson, H. S., 165 New Park Road, S.W.2.
* Jackson, Mrs. Nevill, 55 Bedford Gardens, W.8.
Jackson, Rev. Canon F. J. Foakes, D.D., Union Theological Seminary, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.
Jacob, Professor E. F., M.A., D.Phil., F.S.A., The Victoria University, Manchester.
James, Miss M., M.A., 5 Arboretum Street, Nottingham.
Jamison, Miss E. M., M.A., Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.
Jenkins, R. T., M.A., Rhuddallt, Menai Road, Bangor.
JENKINS, Rev. Canon CLAUDE, D.D., F.S.A., Christ Church, Oxford.
Jenkinson, Hilary, M.A., F.S.A., 29 Cheyne Row, S.W.3.

Jessop, J. C., M.A., Ph.D., Beacon Hill, Lossiemouth, Scotland.
* Johnson, C., M.A., F.B.A., F.S.A., 13A Downshire Hill, N.W.3.
Johnson, J. D. A., LL.D., F.R.S.A. (Irel.), 5 Elton Park, Kingstown, Co. Dublin.
Johnson J. H., M.A., Whitehorns, Cedar Avenue, Chelmsford.
Johnston, D. Hope, M.A., J.P., 1A Regent's Court, Park Road, N.W.1.
Johnston, Rev. J. B., M.A., B.D., 63 Cluny Gardens, Edinburgh.
Johnston, Miss K. L., M.A., 33 Kingswood Avenue, N.W.6.
Johnstone, Professor Hilda, M.A., Holly Cottage, Englefield Green, Surrey.
Johnstone, The Ven. Archdeacon S. M., M.A., F.S.A.(Scot.), St. John's Rectory, Parramatta, New South Wales, Australia.
Jolliffe, J. E., M.A., Keble College, Oxford.
Jones, A. E., M.A., 6 Primrose Drive, Gilstead, Bingley.
Jones, E. Alfred, M.A., F.S.A., Royal Societies Club, St. James's Street, S.W.1.
Jones, Rev. G. Hartwell., D.D., D.Litt., Nutfield Rectory, Redhill, Surrey.
* Jones, G. P., M.A., 109 Ashdell Road, Sheffield, 10.
* Jones, Miss M. E. Monckton, M.A., Green Shade, Crowthorne, Berks.
Jones, Professor T. F., Ph.D., New York University, University Heights, New York, U.S.A.
Jordan, W. K., A.B., A.M., Ph.D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
Judges, A. V., B.A., 52 The Green, Kew, Surrey.

* Kay, H., M.A., Rivington, Palmerston Road, Buckhurst Hill, Essex.
Keenleyside, H. W., M.A., Ph.D., Department of External Affairs, Ottawa, Canada.
Kellogg, Miss L. P., Ph.D., Litt.D., The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., U.S.A.
Kelly, Rev. B. W., Corpus Christi House, 12 Trent Road, S.W.2.
Kelway, Clifton, F.R.G.S., 57 Warwick Square, S.W.1.
Kennedy, W. J. Rann, M.A., Hughenden Cottage, Hughenden, High Wycombe, Bucks.
Kenney, James F., M.A., Ph.D., The Public Archives, Ottawa, Canada.
Kerr, W. B., M.A., Ph.D., University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y., U.S.A.
Ketelbey, Miss D. M., M.A., 5 St. Mary's Place, St. Andrew's, Fife.
*Khan, Sir Shafaat Ahmad Khan, B.A., Litt.D., The University, Allahabad, India.
Khanna, Kahan Chand, M.A., Ph.D., Government College, Lahore, Punjab, India.
King, Colonel E. J., C.M.G., M.A., D.L., The Old House, East Finchley, N.2.
Kingham, W. R., M.A., 37 Westbourne Gardens, W.2.
Kinloch, Rev. T. F., M.A., Morville Hall, Bridgnorth, Shropshire.
Kirkconnell, Professor Watson, M.A., F.R.G.S., Wesley College, Winnipeg, Canada.
* Kirkpatrick, F. A., M.A., 2 Thurloe Court, S.W.3.
Kitchener, E. E., M.A., 34 Coombe Road, Croydon, Surrey.
Klingberg, Professor F. J., A.B., A.M., Ph.D., 405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, Cal., U.S.A.

Knappen, M. M., Faculty Exchange, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.
Knight, L. Stanley, M.A., The School House, Pengam, Glam.
Kohli, Sita Ram, M.A., Lhudiana Government College, Lhudiana, Punjab, India.
Krishnamachasi, T. M., H.H., The Maharajah's College, Trivandrum, Travancore, S. India.
Krishnamurti, N. A., Tirumalai Lodge, Trivandrum, Travancore, S. India.
* Krofta, Professor Kamil, Dr. Phil., The University, Prague, Czecho-Slovakia.

Laistner, Professor M. L. W., M.A., 4 Boardman Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.
La Monte, J. L., Ph.D., University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, U.S.A.
Lanctot, G., Litt.D., The Public Archives, Ottawa, Canada.
Landon, L., 67 St. George's Square, S.W.1.
Langton, Rev. E., B.D., 134 Hill Lane, Blackley, Manchester, 9.
* Langley, Rev. A. S., The Manse, Walsall Street, Wednesbury.
Langstone, Miss R. W., M.A., 30 Corser Street, Stourbridge.
Laprade, Professor W. T., Ph.D., 1108 Monmouth Avenue, Durham, N. Carolina, U.S.A.
Lapsley, G., M.A., Ph.D., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Larson, Professor L. M., Ph.D., LL.D., 315 Lincoln Hall, Urbana, Ill., U.S.A.
Law, Miss A., F.R.S.L., 135 Queen's Road, Blackburn.
Lees, Miss B. A., M.A., 8 Norham Road, Oxford.
Leftwich, B. R., M.B.E., 1 The Avenue, Barnet.
Lega-Weekes, Miss Ethel, Varnello, Topsham Road, Exeter.
Legg, L. G. Wickham, M.A., Foxcombe Rise, Boar's Hill, Oxford.
Lenanton, Mrs. C. M. A., Bride Hall, Ayot St. Lawrence, Welwyn, Herts.
* Lennard, R., M.A., Wadham College, Oxford.
* Leonard, Miss E. M., M.A., 13 Oakwood Court, W.14.
* Lepper, R. S., LL.M., Elsinore, Crawfordsburn, Co. Down.
Letts, M. H. I., F.S.A., 27 West Heath Drive, N.W.11.
Lewin, Evans, M.B.E., Royal Empire Society, Northumberland Avenue, W.C.2.
Lewis, Professor E. A., M.A., D.Sc., University College of Wales, Aberystwyth.
Lewis, Professor M. A., M.A., Royal Naval College, Greenwich, S.E.10.
Lewis, N. B., M.A., Ph.D., 40 Westbourne Road, Sheffield, 10.
Lewis, T. H., M.A., Littleton, Lake Road West, Cardiff.
Leys, Mrs. K. K. M., M.A., St. Hilda's College, Oxford.
Liddell-Hart, Captain B. H., 60 Gloucester Place, W.1.
* Lipson, E., M.A., New College, Oxford.
LITTLE, Andrew G., M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., Risborough, Vine Court Road, Sevenoaks.
* Littler, Rev. H. D., M.A., Red Barns, Redcar.
* Lloyd, H. I., O.B.E., M.A., Civil Court, Basrah, Iraq.
* LLOYD, Professor Sir JOHN, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A., Gwaen Deg, Bangor.

Lock, Arthur B., Dulwich Road School, Kingstanding, Birmingham.
Lockitt, C. H., M.A., The Grammar School, Bungay, Suffolk.
* Longden, Rev. H. I., M.A., F.S.A., Heyford Rectory, Northampton.
Loomis, Professor Louise, Ph.D., Wells College, Aurora-on-Cayuga, New York, U.S.A.
Lovegrove, E. W., M.A., F.S.A., St. David's, Chipping Campden, Glos.
* Loyd, L. C., B.A., 25 Moore Street, S.W.3.
Lumb, Miss S. V., M.A., 364 Great Clowes Street, Higher Broughton, Salford, 7.
Lunt, Professor W. E., Ph.D., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., U.S.A.
* Lybyer, Professor A. H., A.M., Ph.D., 1006 West Nevada Street, Urbana, Ill., U.S.A.
* Lydall, John French, M.A., LL.D., 37 John Street, Bedford Row, W.C.1.
Lydekker, J. W., M.A., The White House, Harpenden, Herts.
Lyell, James P. R., J.P., B.Litt., Falkland, Boar's Hill, Oxford.

Macalister, Professor R. A. S., Litt.D., F.S.A., 18 Mount Eden Road, Dublin, S.W.1.
Macartney, C. A., All Souls College, Oxford.
* McClellan, Professor George B., M.A., LL.D., 2424 California Street, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
McCoy, C., Eagle Dell, Ware Road, Hailey, Hertford.
McElroy, Professor R., M.A., LL.D., Ph.D., 78 Banbury Road, Oxford.
McFarlane, K. B., M.A., Magdalen College, Oxford.
McHaffie, W. H., M.A., Bow Central School, Coborn Street, E.3.
McIlwain, Professor C. H., Ph.D., LL.D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
McKay, D. C., A.B., M.A., Ph.D., 232 Prospect Street, Belmont, Mass., U.S.A.
Mackie, Professor J. D., M.A., 9 The University, Glasgow, W.2.
McKisack, Miss May, M.A., B.Litt., Somerville College, Oxford.
McLachlan, Rev. H., M.A., D.D., Summerville, Victoria Park, Manchester.
MacLaughlin, M. C., M.A., Overton Lea, Cheltenham.
McLaughlin, Professor A. C., A.M., LL.D., 5609 Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.
McLennan, Senator J. S., The Senate, Ottawa, Canada.
McMaster, Mrs. Ian, M.A., Eton College, Windsor.
McNamara, W. H., 29 Campbell Road, E.17.
McNulty, Rev. J., B.A., St. Francis of Assisi, Garston, Liverpool.
Macnutt, The Ven. Archdeacon F. R., M.A., Provost's House, Stoneygate, Leicester.
Magrath, C. J., O.B.E., D.Litt., 173 Rustlings Road, Sheffield.
Mainwaring, J., M.A., Lingwood, St. James' Road, Dudley.
Major, Miss E. H., C.B.E., M.A., LL.D., 1A Camp View, S.W.19.
Major, Miss K., B.A., B.Litt., 21 Queen's Way, Lincoln.
* Malden, Rev. E. E., M.A., M.B.E., The Vicarage, Amberley, North Canterbury, New Zealand.
Malden, The Very Rev. R. H., M.A., B.D., The Deanery, Wells.
Manning, B. L., M.A., Jesus College, Cambridge.
Manwaring, G. E., Silverwood, 117 Burdon Lane, Belmont, Surrey.
Marsh, Professor F. B., Ph.D., University of Texas, Austin, Texas, U.S.A.

Marshall, Miss D., M.A., Mill House, Bethersden, Kent.
Marshall, Professor R. L., M.A., LL.D., 1 College Avenue, Magee College, Londonderry.
* Marten, C. H. K., M.A., Waynflete House, Eton College, Windsor.
Martin, Miss E. C., M.A., Ph.D., Westfield College, Hampstead, N.W.3.
Martin, Thomas P., A.B., A.M., Ph.D., MSS. Dept., Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
Marvin, F. S., M.A., H.M.I., Pantiles, Welwyn Garden City, Herts.
* Mason, Rev. W. A. Parker, M.A., Ardleigh Vicarage, Colchester.
Mathew, Rev. A. G., M.A., Blackfriars, Oxford.
* Mathew, Rev. D. J., M.A., Litt.D., F.S.A., 1 Woburn Square, W.C.1.
Mathews, G. W., F.S.A., 11 Ennerdale Road, Wallasey, Cheshire.
Matthews, A. G., M.A., Farncote, Oxted, Surrey.
* Mathur, Tikait Narain, B.A., LL.B., 30/27 Chili-ent Road, Agra, U.P., India.
Mears, R. A. F., M.A., B.Litt., 12 Polstead Road, Oxford.
Medley, Professor D. J., M.A., Ashby, Tydehams, Newbury, Berks.
Medlicott, W. N., M.A., University College, Swansea.
Mellows, W. T., LL.B., Scalford, Thorpe Road, Peterborough.
Merriman, Professor Roger B., M.A., Master's Lodgings, Eliot House, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
Methley, Miss Violet M., Stuart House, 46 Heriot Road, N.W.4.
Miller, W., M.A., F.B.A., British Archæological School, Rue Spensiopos, Athens, Greece.
* Mills, Colonel D. A., 29 Pembroke Road, W.8.
Mitchell, Miss R. J., M.A., B.Litt., Little Cliff, Lyme Regis, Dorset.
Montgomery, Mrs. I. A., M.A., Ph.D., 18 Northumberland Street, Edinburgh.
Moody, T. W., B.A., Ph.D., Queen's University, Belfast.
* Moor, Rev. Charles, M.A., D.D., F.S.A., 50 Harrington Gardens, S.W.7.
Moore, H. Stuart, F.S.A., 6 King's Bench Walk, Temple, E.C.4.
Moore, Miss M. F., M.A., Ph.D., 135 Mayfield Road, Edinburgh, 9.
* Moorman, Mrs., B.A., 6 Church Square, Leighton Buzzard.
Moreton, Rev. H. A. V., B.A., D. ès Lettres (Besançon), The Close, Hereford.
* Morgan, Professor W. T., M.A., Ph.D., Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., U.S.A.
* Morison, Professor J. L., M.A., D.Litt., Fellside, Corbridge, Northumberland.
Morley, T. H., B.Sc., 312 King's Road, Reading.
Morrah, D. M. M., M.A., 33 Bedford Place, W.C.1.
Morrell, W. P., M.A., D.Phil., 4 Alma Terrace, W.8.
Morris, Ernest, 24 Coventry Street, Leicester.
* Morris, Rev. Professor H. C. S., M.A., 28 The Close, Salisbury.
Morris, Professor W. A., Ph.D., University of California, Berkeley, Cal., U.S.A.
Mounfield, A., 34 Walton Road, Warrington.
* Muller, Professor J. A., Ph.D., 4 St. John's Road, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
Mumby, F. A., 135 Foxley Lane, Purley, Surrey.
Murray, Miss K. M. E., B.A., B.Litt., Upper Cranmore, Heyshott, Midhurst, Sussex.

Myres, J. N. L., M.A., Christ Church, Oxford.
Myres, Rev. M. W., D.D., Frodsham Vicarage, nr. Warrington.

Namier, Professor L. B., M.A., The Victoria University, Manchester.
Narayan, Brij., M.A., c/o Allahabad Bank, Ltd., Delhi, India.
* Nathan, Lt.-Col. The Right Hon. Sir Matthew, G.C.M.G., LL.D., The Manor House, West Coker, Yeovil.
* Neale, Professor J. E., M.A., University College, Gower Street, W.C.1.
Nef, Professor J. U., Ph.D., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.
Neilson, Professor N., Ph.D., Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass., U.S.A.
Newhall, Professor R. A., Ph.D., Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., U.S.A.
NEWTON, Professor A. P., M.A., D.Lit., F.S.A., 44 Meadway Court, N.W.11.
Nichols, J. F., M.C., M.A., Ph.D., F.S.A., 105 College Road, Isleworth, Middlesex.
* Nicholson, T. C., M.A., Strathmore, Wath-upon-Dearne, nr. Rotherham.
Nijhoff, Wouter, Lange Voorhout 9, The Hague, Holland.
Noakes, Miss J., Little Lindens, Linden Path, Leatherhead.
Nobbs, D., M.A., 51 Craiglockhart Avenue, Edinburgh, 11.
* Nunn, William, M.P., Ponsonby Hall, Calderbridge, Cumberland.

Oakley, T. P., Ph.D., 522 West 122nd Street, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.
O'Brien, Rev. E. M., M.A., Ph.D., Chapel Road, Bankstown, Sydney, Australia.
O'Connell, Rev. Sir John R., M.A., LL.D., Artillery Mansions, 75 Victoria Street, S.W.1.
Offer, Rev. C. J., M.A., Highmore Vicarage, Henley, Oxon.
* Oke, A. W., B.A., LL.M., F.S.A., 32 Denmark Villas, Hove, Sussex.
OMAN, Professor Sir CHARLES, M.P., D.C.L., LL.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., Frewin Hall, Oxford,
* Osborn, J. Lee, Bevis, Liddington, near Swindon.
O'Sullivan, Professor Mary J. Donovan, M.A., Lisgorm, Galway, Ireland.
Owen, Hugh, M.A., F.S.A., Bryn Gwyn, Llangefni, Anglesey.
* Owen, Commander (retired), J. H., Orielton, Maidstone Road, Chatham.
Owen, Professor L. V. D., M.A., University College, Nottingham.
* Owen, R., Argraffdy Owen, Welshpool.
Owst, G. R., Litt.D., D.Lit., Ph.D., 11 Perceval Road, S.W.14.

Packard, Professor S. R., Ph.D., 85 Washington Avenue, Northampton, Mass., U.S.A.
Page, M. E., Fore Street, Bridgwater.
Page, Miss Frances M., M.A., Ph.D., 33 Billing Road, Northampton.
Pakeman, Professor S. A., M.C., M.A., University College, Colombo, Ceylon.
Pantin, W. A., M.A., F.S.A., Oriel College, Oxford.
PARES, R., M.A., All Souls College, Oxford.
Parker, Captain H., F.R.G.S., 2 Albemarle Street, W.1.
Parker, H. M. D., M.A., Magdalen College, Oxford.

* Parker, Colonel J. W. R., C.B., D.L., J.P., V.P.S.A., Brownsholme Hall, nr. Clitheroe, Lancs.
* Parker, L. N., F.R.A.M., 17 Prince of Wales Terrace, W.8.
* Parkinson, C. N., M.A., Ph.D., Emmanuel College, Cambridge.
Parsloe, C. G., B.A., 19 Sispara Gardens, S.W.18.
Passfield, The Right Hon. Lord, LL.B., Passfield Corner, Liphook, Hants.
Pearce, J. P., F.R.I.B.A., 21 Dale Street, Liverpool, 2.
Pearn, B. R., M.A., University College Rangoon, Burma.
* Pearson, Rev. A. F. Scott, D.Th., D.Litt., The Manse, Johnstone, Renfrewshire.
Peel, Rev. Albert, M.A., Litt.D., 97 Russell Road, Buckhurst Hill.
Peel, J. K., M.A., 6 Canterbury Terrace, Leicester.
Penn, C. D., M.A., 25 Henderson Road, S.W.18.
Penson, Professor Lillian M., Ph.D., Bedford College, Regent's Park, N.W.1
Perkins, Rev. Canon J. H. T., M.A., D.C.L., F.S.A., 5 Little Cloisters, Westminster Abbey, S.W.1.
Perroy, E. M. J., D.-ès-L., 38 rue du Molinel, Lille, Nord France.
Petrie, Sir Charles, Bt., M.A., 14 Tregunter Road, The Boltons, S.W.10.
Peyton, S. A., Ph.D., 20 London Road, Reading.
* Phelps, Rev. P. B., M.A., Swanmore, near Bishop's Waltham, Hants.
Pickthorn, K. W. M., M.A., M.P., Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.
Pieris, P. E., C.M.G., Litt.D., Ceylon Civil Service, Colombo, Ceylon.
Pinchbeck, Miss I., M.A., Ph.D., 7 Woburn Square, W.C.1.
Plucknett, Professor T. F. T., M.A., LL.B., 17 Crescent Road, S.W.20.
Plunket, Miss Ierne A. L., M.A., Knockderry, Ashley Road, Walton-on-Thames, Surrey.
* POLLARD, A. F., D.Lit., Litt.D., F.B.A., Brierfield, Milford-on-Sea, Hants.
* POLLOCK, The Right Hon. Sir FREDERICK, Bt., K.C., D.C.L., LL.D., F.B.A., F.S.A., 21 Hyde Park Place, W.2.
Pond, P. J., Springfield House, Chalford, Stroud, Glos.
Ponsonby-Fane, R. A. B., LL.D., 18 Minamioji, Kamikamo, Kyoto, Japan.
Poole, A. L., M.A., St. John's College, Oxford.
Porteus, Rev. T. C., M.A., B.D., St. George's Vicarage, Chorley, Lancs.
Postan, M., M.Sc., Peterhouse, Cambridge.
Potter, H., Ph.D., LL.B., King's College, Strand, W.C.2.
* Potter, Professor G. R., Ph.D., M.A., The University, Sheffield.
Powell, Miss D. L., B.A., 51 Elm Park Mansions, Park Walk, S.W.10.
* Powell, Miss Helen L., 127 Vassall Road, S.W.9.
Powell, Miss I. G., M.A., Royal Holloway College, Englefield Green, Surrey.
Powell-Price, J. C., M.A., c/o Messrs. Grindley & Co., Bombay, India.
Power, C. E., 2 Brook Green Studios, Dunsany Road, W.14.
Power, Professor Eileen E., M.A., D.Lit., Litt.D., 20 Mecklenburgh Square, W.C.1.
POWICKE, Professor F. M., M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A., Oriel College, Oxford.
Powley, E. B., B.A., B.Litt., 6 Partridge Road, Blundellsands, Liverpool, 23.
Pratt, Rev. M. A. R., 5 Epworth Chambers, P.O. Box, 931, Christchurch, New Zealand.
Prestage, Professor Edgar, M.A., D.Litt., 16 Holland Street, W.8.

Preston, A. E., F.S.A., Whitefield, Abingdon.
* Previté-Orton, Professor C. W., M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A., 55 Bateman Street, Cambridge.
Proby, Granville, M.A., F.S.A., Elton Hall, Peterborough.
Procter, Miss Evelyn E. S., M.A., St. Hugh's College, Oxford.
Pryce, A. I., M.A., Diocesan Registry, Bangor.
Purvis, A., B.Sc., 6 Greenhalgh Walk, N.2.
Purvis, Rev. J. S., M.A., Cranleigh School, near Guildford.
Putnam, Professor Bertha H., Ph.D., Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass., U.S.A.
Pybus, Miss H. J., M.A., Newnham College, Cambridge.

Raby, F. J. E., C.B., M.A., F.S.A., Southways, Douglas Road, Harpenden, Herts.
Radford, C. A. R., B.A., Bradninch Manor, Devon.
Radice, Mrs. Charles, Coombe House, Coombe, near Oxford.
Rae, D., M.A., Teachers' Training College, Auckland, New Zealand.
Ragatz, Professor L. J., M.A., Ph.D., The George Washington University, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
Ramsbotham, R. B., M.B.E., M.A., B.Litt., Muslim University, Aligarh, U.P., India.
Ramsey, R. W., F.S.A., 43 Ladbroke Square, W.11.
Ravenshaw, J., B.A., 10 West Hill, N.6.
Rawlinson, H. G., M.A., c/o Thos. Cook & Son, Berkeley Street, W.1.
Ray, J. E., 9 Stanley Road, Hastings.
Read, Conyers, Ph.D., Villa Nova, Pa, U.S.A.
* Realey, C. B., Ph.D., University Club, 1435 Ohio Street, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.
Reaney, P. H., M.A., Ph.D., 12 Howard Road, Walthamstow, Essex.
Reddaway, T. F., M.A., 2 Buckingham Road, Cambridge.
* Reddaway, W. F., M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
Redlich, Rev. Canon E. B., M.A., B.D., Little Bowden Rectory, Market Harborough.
Redstone, V. B., F.S.A., 3 Seckford Street, Woodbridge.
Rees, Rev. T. Mardy, 24 Rugby Avenue, Neath, S. Wales.
REES, Professor W., M.A., D.Sc., University College, Cathay's Park, Cardiff.
Reid, Miss R. R., M.A., D.Lit., 40 Cholmley Gardens, N.W.6.
Relf, Professor Frances H., Ph.D., Wells College, Aurora-on-Cayuga, New York, U.S.A.
* Renaut, Professor F. P., LL.D., D.Litt., 38 rue du Lourmel, Paris, XV^e, France.
Renier, G. J., Ph.D., 17A Great Ormond Street, W.C.1.
Rennard, T. A., M.A., Oak Lodge, Sidmouth Junction, Honiton, Devon.
Rich, E. E., M.A., St. Catharine's College, Cambridge.
Richardson, H. G., M.A., B.Sc., High Barn, 14 Sheridan Road, S.W.19.
Richardson, Mrs. Herbert, B.A., 48 Junction Road, Andover.
Richardson, Professor R. K., Ph.D., Beloit College, Beloit, Wis., U.S.A.
Richmond, Admiral Sir W. H., K.C.B., M.A., Downing College, Cambridge.
Riddell, The Hon. Mr. Justice W. Renwick, B.Sc., LL.D., Hon. L.H.D., Osgoode Hall, Toronto, Canada.

Riker, Professor T. W., B.Litt., 2300 Leon Street, Austin, Texas, U.S.A.
Rimmer, Rev. J. S., M.A., B.D., The Rectory, Ulverston.
* Roberts, Captain J. H., F.R.G.S., F.S.I., 61 Wind Street, Swansea.
Roberts, P. E., M.A., Worcester College, Oxford.
* ROBERTS, R. A., Smithy Cottage, Orford, Woodbridge.
Robertson, Sir C. Grant, C.V.O., M.A., All Souls College, Oxford.
Robertson, L. A., M.A., B.Litt., 1 Cambridge Street, Edinburgh.
Robinson, Professor Chalfant, Ph.D., Princeton University, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A.
Robinson, Professor E. E., Ph.D., Stanford University, Cal., U.S.A.
Robinson, Miss E. M., Moylena, 80 Underhill Road, S.E.22.
Robinson, Professor Howard, M.A., Ph.D., LD.D., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, U.S.A.
* Robinson, Morgan P., M.A., LL.B., 113 S. 3rd Street, Richmond, Va., U.S.A.
*Rodkey, F. S., A.M., Ph.D., 325 Lincoln Hall, Urbana, Ill., U.S.A.
Roe, F. Gordon, Kingston Lodge, 24 Addison Road, W.14.
Ronan, Rev. M. V., 6 Eblana Avenue, Dun Laoghaire, Co. Dublin.
Rosenberg, Hans W., D.Phil., Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill., U.S.A.
Rose-Troup, Mrs. Frances, Bradleigh End, Ottery St. Mary, Devon.
Roth, Cecil, M.A., B.Litt., D.Phil., 65 Compayne Gardens, N.W.6.
Rothwell, H., B.A., Ph.D., The University, Edinburgh.
* Routh, Miss E. M. G., Fairpark House, Exeter.
Routledge, F. J., M.A., B.Litt., 19 Banks Avenue, Great Meols, Wirral, Cheshire.
Rowe, Miss B. J. H., M.A., B.Litt., c/o National Provincial Bank, The Square, Bournemouth.
Runciman, J. C. S., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Russell, Ephraim, M.A., B.Sc., Newlands, Swanlon, Winsford, Cheshire.
Russell, J. C., Ph.D., 422 Cameron Avenue, Chapel Hill, N.C., U.S.A.
Rutherford, Professor J., M.A., Ph.D., University College, Auckland, New Zealand.
Ruud, M. B., Ph.D., 429 Walnut Street, S.E., Minneapolis, Minn., U.S.A.

Sadler, H. W. W., 50 Vernon Road, Leigh-on-Sea, Essex.
Sage, Professor W. N., M.A., Ph.D., University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.
Sainsbury, Miss E. B., 29 Abercorn Place, N.W.8.
* Salter, F. R., M.A., Magdalene College, Cambridge.
Saltmarsh, J., M.A., King's College, Cambridge.
Samuel, W. S., 102 Cheapside, E.C.2.
Sanigar, W. T., 205 Avon Vale Road, Barton Hill, Bristol.
Sastri, K. N. V., M.A., Ph.D., H.H. Maharajah's College, Mysore, India.
Saunders, H. W., M.A., D.Litt., The Grammar School, Horsmonden, Kent.
Sayles, G. O., M.A., D.Litt., The University, Glasgow.
Scholefield, G. H., O.B.E., D.Sc., 42 Upper Watt Street, Highland Park, Wellington, New Zealand.
Schuyler, Professor R. L., A.M., Ph.D., Columbia University, New York City, N.Y., U.S.A.
Scofield, B., M.A., Ph.D., British Museum, W.C.1.

* Scofield, Miss Cora L., Ph.D., The College Club, 40 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.
Scott, Professor Ernest, M.A., The University, Melbourne, Australia.
Scott, Rev. H. S., D.Phil., B.Litt., Oddington Rectory, Islip, Oxon.
Searley, A. W., Northernhay, Kingskerswell, Devon.
Sears, Professor L. M., Ph.D., Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana, U.S.A.
* Seebohm, Hugh Exton, J.P., Poynders End, Hitchin.
Sefton-Jones, Mrs. H. M., Hampton Court Palace, Hampton Court, Middx.
Sen, Surendra Nath, M.A., Ph.D., B.Litt., 6/3 Ekdalia Road, Ballygunge, Calcutta, India.
Seton-Watson, Professor R. W., D.Litt., Ph.D., F.B.A., 1 Parkside Gardens, S.W.19.
* Seybolt, Professor R. F., M.A., Ph.D., University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., U.S.A.
Seymour, Professor C., LL.D., Litt.D., Yale University, New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.
* Shaw, Professor P. E., M.A., Ph.D., Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn., U.S.A.
Shaw, W. B., F.S.A.(Scot.), 56 Sandy Lane, Stretford, near Manchester.
* Shawcross, Major G. N., R.E. (T.A.), M.B.E., Deanwood, Rivington, nr. Bolton.
Shelley, R. J. A., Denbie House, Formby, Lancs.
Shelley-Rolls, Sir J. C. E., Bt., Avington Park, Winchester.
Sherwani, Professor H. K., M.A., Osmania University College, Hyderabad, Deccan, India.
* Shettle, Rev. G. T., L.A., Hunsingore House, Wetherby, Yorks.
* Shipman, H. R., Ph.D., 27 Mercer Street, Princeton, N.J., U.S.A.
Shirley, Rev. F. J., M.A., LL.B., Precincts 15, Canterbury.
Siebert, Professor W. H., M.A., University Hall, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, U.S.A.
* Sieveking, A. Forbes, F.S.A., 7 Belsize Grove, N.W.3.
Sikes, J. G., M.A., Newnham Grove, Cambridge.
* Simpson, Rev. F. A., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Skipton, Rev. H. P. K., F.S.A., St. Philip's Parsonage, Reigate.
* Slater, Professor Gilbert, M.A., 4 Park Crescent, Oxford.
Slosser, Rev. Professor G. J., S.T.M., Ph.D., 203 Summit Avenue, Bellevue, Pittsburg, Pa., U.S.A.
Smart, Lieut.-Colonel F. W. B., M.A., Rathmoyle, Hurtmore, Godalming.
Smith, Donald, F.R.G.S., Byways, Mollands Lane, South Ockendon, Essex.
Smith, D. B., The Library, Admiralty, S.W.1.
* Smith, Miss M. Howes, M.A., 2 Sunny Bank, Stamford Road, Bowdon, Cheshire.
Smith, W. Owston, M.A., I.E.S., 41 Molyneux Park, Tunbridge Wells.
* Smyth, Rev. C. H. E., M.A., 186 Huntingdon Road, Cambridge.
Soltau, Professor R. H., M.A., American University, Beirut, Syria.
Somers, Rev. H. J., J.C.B., M.A., Ph.D., St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, Nova Scotia.
Southam, Colonel L. A. C., D.S.O., Rodney House, Malvern Link.
Southern, R. W., B.A., Exeter College, Oxford.
Spencer, T. P., M.A., County Secondary School, Heanor, Nottingham.

Spens, H. B., B.A., 25 Park Circus, Glasgow.
Stafford, G. W., M.A., Moorbeck, Lightwood Road, Buxton.
Stamp, A. E., C.B., M.A., F.S.A. (*Auditor*), Public Record Office, Chancery Lane, W.C.2.
* Stampa, L., M.A., F.S.A., Stanton, Higher Erith Road, Torquay.
Standing, T. G., M.A., Prince Edward School, Salisbury, S. Rhodesia, South Africa.
Steed, Wickham, LL.D., 7 Lansdowne House, Holland Park, W.11.
Steefel, L. D., M.A., Ph.D., 735 Huron Street, S.E., Minneapolis, Minn., U.S.A.
Steel, A. B., M.A., Christ's College, Cambridge.
STENTON, Professor F. M. (*President*), M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., The University, Reading.
Stock, Leo F., M.A., Ph.D., LL.D., Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1017 Michigan Avenue, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
Stretton, Miss G., M.A., 8 Devonshire Gardens, W.4.
Summers, H. F., Market Place, Southwell, Notts.
Sumner, B. H., M.A., Balliol College, Oxford.
Sumner, E. J., M.A., Sedgwick House, Sedbergh, Yorks.
Sutherland, Miss L. S., M.A., Somerville College, Oxford.
Sweet, Professor A. H., A.M., Ph.D., Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa., U.S.A.
Sykes, Rev. Professor Norman, M.A., D.Phil., 5 Hill Top, N.W.11.

* Tanner, Miss E. M., B.A., Roedean School, Brighton.
TANNER, L. E., M.V.O., M.A., F.S.A., 49 Romney Street, S.W.1.
Tapley-Soper, H., F.L.A., F.S.A., City Library, Castle Street, Exeter.
Tarn, W. W., Litt.D., F.B.A., Muirtown House, Inverness, Scotland.
Tate, W. E., Sneyd Church School, Nile Street, Burslem, Staffs.
Tawney, Professor R. H., B.A., Litt.D., F.B.A., 44 Mecklenburgh Square, W.C.1.
* Tayler, Miss H., 181 Queens Gate, S.W.7.
Taylor, Professor Eva G. R., D.Sc., 34 Oakley Street, S.W.3.
Taylor, Rt. Rev. Abbot F. L. A. Taylor, M.A., M.C., St. Augustine's Abbey, Ramsgate.
* TEMPERLEY, Professor H. W. V., O.B.E., Litt.D., F.B.A., Peterhouse, Cambridge.
Thistlethwaite, B., 10 Victoria Road, Harborne, Birmingham.
Thomas, A. H., M.A., LL.D., F.S.A., Records Office, Guildhall, E.C.2.
Thompson, Miss A. D., Sylvan Hall, Upper Lewes Road, Brighton.
THOMPSON, Professor A. Hamilton, D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A., Beck Cottage, Adel, Leeds.
Thompson, Miss B. M. Hamilton, M.A., B.Litt., St. Hugh's College, Oxford.
Thompson, Rev. J. M., M.A., Magdalen College, Oxford.
Thomson, Miss G. Scott, M.A., F.S.A., 23 Carlisle Mansions, Carlisle Place, S.W.1.
Thomson, M. A., M.A., D.Phil., 123 Gower Street, W.C.1.
Thomson Rev. Professor S. Harrison, B.Litt. Ph.D., Colorado University, Boulder, Col., U.S.A.
Thomson, T. R. F., M.A., Benenden, Kent.
Thornley, Miss I. D., M.A., 6 Cholmeley Crescent, N.6.

Thrupp, Miss S. L., M.A., Ph.D., 2626 13th Avenue, West, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
Tipping, C. H., B.A., 1 St. George's Square, Cheltenham.
Todd, Professor J. E., M.A., Queen's University, Belfast.
* Todhunter, Sir Charles, K.C.S.I., Bangalore, India.
Tolhurst, J. B. L., 47 Manor Road, Beckenham, Kent.
Tomkeieff, Mrs. O. G., M.A., LL.B., 42 Highbury, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Tompkins, H. W., 8 Cromer Road, Southend-on-Sea.
Tory, Henry Marshall, M.A., LL.D., D.Sc., 327 Buena Vista Road, Rockcliffe Park, Ottawa, Canada.
Tout, Mrs. T. F., M.A., 10 North Square, N.W.11.
Toye, D. B., O.B.E., LL.D., 32 Welbeck Avenue, Hove, Sussex.
Toynbee, Miss M. R., M.A., Ph.D., 5 Park Crescent, Oxford.
Toyne, S. M., M.A., Little Acres, Ware, Herts.
Treat, Professor P. J., Ph.D., 750 Dolores Street, Stanford University, Cal., U.S.A.
Treharne, Professor R. F., M.A., Ph.D., Hillside, Brynymor Road, Aberystwyth.
* TREVELYAN, Professor G. M., O.M., Litt.D., F.B.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Trotter, R. G., A.B., A.M., Ph.D., Queen's University, Kingston, Canada.
Tunstall, W. C. B., M.A., Royal Naval College, Greenwich, S.E.10.
Turberville, Professor A. S., M.A., B.Litt., 94 Potternewton Lane, Leeds.
* Turton, Major Robert Bell, Kildale Hall, Kildale, Yorks.
Tweedsmuir, Lord C. H., LL.D., D.C.L., Elsfield Manor, Oxford.
Tyler, J. E., M.A., The University, Sheffield.
Tyson, M., M.A., Ph.D., The Victoria University, Manchester.

Underhill, Professor F. H., M.A., The University, Toronto, Canada.
*Usher, Professor R. G., Ph.D., Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., U.S.A.

Van der Byl, F. V., M.A., Ph.D., Litt.D., Craigend Park School, Edinburgh, 9.
Vaucher, Professor Paul, D. ès L., Queen Anne's Mansions, S.W.1.
Vaughan, W. W., M.A., D.Litt., The Manor House, Princes Risborough, Bucks.
Veale, E. W. W., LL.D., 14 Orchard Street, Bristol.
VEITCH, Professor G. S., M.A., Litt.D., 8 Brompton Avenue, Liverpool, 17.
* Vickers, Principal K. H., M.A., University College, Southampton.
Vincent, Professor J. M., Ph.D., 406 South Holliston Avenue, Pasadena, Cal., U.S.A.

* Wade, C. E., M.A., 39 Regent's Park Road, N.W.1.
* Wake, Miss Joan, Northamptonshire Record Society, County Hall, Northampton.
Wale, W., Cambridge Villas, 121 The Promenade, Cheltenham.
Walker, Professor E. A., M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge.
Walker, Major G. G., D.S.O., M.C., Armoury House, City Road, E.C.1.
Walker, J., M.A., Ph.D., Kelbrook, Greenrigg Gardens, Alexandra Road, Sunderland.

Walker, J. Holland, M.B.E., F.S.A., 15 Park Valley, Nottingham.
* Walker, J. W., O.B.E., F.S.A., Twemlow Hall, Holmes Chapel, Cheshire.
* Walker, Robert J., F.R.G.S., F.S.A., Ormidale, Knighton Park Road, Leicester.
Walker, W. H. T., M.A., New Street, Heckington, nr. Sleaford, Lincs.
* Wall, J. C., 108 Canterbury Road, Leyton, E.10.
Wallace, Malcolm W., B.A., Ph.D., 91 Walmer Road, Toronto, Canada.
* Ward, Mrs. J. G. S., B.A., Ph.D., Unsted, Hartswood Road, Brentwood, Essex.
* Warmington, Professor E. H., 48 Flower Lane, N.W.7.
Watson, W. G. Willis, M.A., Single's Lodge, Pinhoe, Exeter.
* Watt, James, LL.D., W.S., 7 Blackford Road, Edinburgh, 10.
* Watts, Rev. Herbert C., 27 Jaycroft, Burnham-on-Sea.
Weaver, F. J., M.A., Beechleys, Winkton Common, Christchurch.
Webster, Professor C. K., M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A., 38 Mecklenburgh Square, W.C.1.
Wedgwood, Miss C. V., B.A., 23 Sheffield Terrace, W.8.
Weeks, Rev. G. E. A., M.A., B.D., LL.D., Fenny Compton Rectory, Leamington Spa.
Weiner, A., M.A., 23 Tudor Close, Belsize Park, N.W.3.
Weitzmann, Miss S., M.A., Ph.D., 15 Clissold Court, Green Lanes, N.4.
Welbourne, E., M.A., Emmanuel College, Cambridge.
Wellstood, F. C., M.A., F.S.A., 19 Henley Street, Stratford-on-Avon.
Westergaard, Professor Waldemar, Ph.D., 1000 Manning Avenue, Los Angeles, Cal., U.S.A.
Whale, Miss G. B., B.A., 29 Park Place, Cardiff.
Wheeler, H. F. B., D.Litt. (Hon.), Balholmen, Grove Road, Northwood, Middlesex.
White, A. B., Ph.D., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., U.S.A.
* White, Miss E. M., Westcroft, Norton Road, Wembley, Middlesex.
White, G. H., 222 South Norwood Hill, S.E.25.
Whitehead, A. W., M.A., Grenville, La Rocque, Jersey, Channel Islands.
Whiteley, J. G., 223 West Lanvale Street, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.
Whitelock, Miss D., M.A., St. Hilda's College, Oxford.
* Whitfield, Professor A. S., B.Litt., Dyffryn-on-Sea, Merioneth.
Whiting, Rev. Professor C. E., D.D., B.C.L., F.S.A., St. Chad's College, Durham.
* Whitley, Rev. W. T., LL.D., 18 New London Road, Chelmsford.
WHITNEY, Rev. Professor J. P., D.D., D.C.L., 6 St. Peter's Terrace, Cambridge.
Whitty, R. G. H., M.A., Broomleigh, Staplegrove Road, Taunton.
Whyte, Rev. A. J. B., M.A., Litt.D., 26 Latimer Road, Headington, Oxford.
Wilkinson, Rev. J. T., M.A., B.D., Roseville, Knighton, Radnorshire.
Wilkinson, M., M.A., St. John's College, Oxford.
Williams, A. J., M.A., Church House, The Ridgeway, N.W.7.
Williams, The Very Rev. A. T. P., M.A., Christ Church, Oxford.
Williams, Professor Basil, M.A., F.B.A., The University, Edinburgh.
Williams, Professor C. H., M.A., 13 St. John's Wood Terrace, N.W.8.
Williams, H. G., M.A., High School for Boys, Westcliff-on-Sea.
Williams, Rev. James, 29 Polstead Road, Oxford.

Williams, Miss Judith B., Ph.D., Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass., U.S.A.
Williams, Professor J. W., M.A., B.Litt., The Roundel, St. Andrews, Fife.
Williams, L. F. Rusbrook, M.A., Rye House, Silchester, near Reading.
Williams, T. G., M.A., 63 Eardley Crescent, S.W.5.
Williams, Rev. Watkin, M.A., Wentworth House, Great Malvern.
Williams, W. W., B.Sc., Sedgemead, Wroxham Drive, Upton, Wirral, Cheshire.
Williamson, Rev. C. C. H., 68 Hazlewood Crescent, W.10.
Williamson, F., Museum and Art Gallery, Derby.
Willson, D. H., Ph.D., University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., U.S.A.
Wilson, A. E., M.A., Terrington, Tivoli Crescent, Brighton.
Wilson, H. W., D.Litt., 203 Elgin Avenue, W.9.
* Wilson, Rev. S. G., B.Litt., F.S.A.(Scot.), Blean Vicarage, Canterbury.
Winfield, Professor P. H., LL.D., F.B.A., 13 Cranmer Road, Cambridge.
Winstanley, D. A., M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Wittke, Professor Carl, A.B., A.M., Ph.D., 278 West College Street, Oberlin, Ohio, U.S.A.
Wood, A. C., M.A., B.Litt., D.Phil., 21 Elm Avenue, Beeston, Nottingham.
WOOD, HERBERT, B.A., F.S.A., 74 Hazlewell Road, S.W.15.
Wood, Miss M., M.A., Ph.D., 16 Buckingham Terrace, Edinburgh.
Wood, N., M.A., Ph.D., 53 London Road, Sleaford, Lincs.
Wood, William, Rock House, Polperro, Cornwall.
Woodbine, Professor G. E., B.A., Ph.D., LL.B., Guilford, Conn., U.S.A.
Woodhead, E. W., M.A., 39 Eaton Road, Norwich.
Wood-Legh, Miss K. L., B.Litt., Ph.D., 49 Owlstone Road, Cambridge.
Woods, E. C., L.D.S., R.C.S., Green Gables, Bowness-on-Windermere.
Woodward, E. Ll., M.A., All Souls College, Oxford.
Wordsworth, Rev. Canon C., M.A., St. Nicholas's Hospital, Salisbury.
Workman, Rev. H. B., D.D., D.Lit., Westminster College, Horseferry Road, S.W.1.
WRONG, Professor G. M., M.A., LL.D., 73 Walmer Road, Toronto, Canada.
Wynn, Rev. H. E., M.A., Pembroke College, Cambridge.

Yorke, Philip Chesney, M.A., L.-ès-L., 98 Addison Road, W.14.
Young, R. Fitzgibbon, M.A., D.Phil., Boldrewood, Claygate, Surrey.

Zaleski, August, B.Sc., Bank Handlowy, Warsaw, Poland.

ASSOCIATES OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Beaumont, H., M.A., 85 Northampton Road, Wellingborough.
Bennett, R. F., B.A., 48 Hornchurch Road, Romford, Essex.
Blaydon, G. R., Guildhall, Thetford, Norfolk.
Borough, Rev. R. F., M.A., Bradbourne Vicarage, Ashbourne, Derbyshire.
Brown, Miss M. M. M. Graham, M.A., The Training College, Truro.
Bruce, M., B.A., 13 White Road, Sutton Coldfields, Warwick.

Collar, H., The Museum, Saffron Walden, Essex.
Cook, E. T., 116 Westwood Park, S.E.23.
Crews, C. C., M.A., Highfield, The Flats, Blackwater, nr. Camberley, Hants.

Elvin, L., 29 Boultham Avenue, Lincoln,
Emsden, Nevil, 26 Sherborne Avenue, Norwood Green, Southall, Middx.

Gregory, Miss A. L., M.A., Ph.D., Bradda, Frewland Avenue, Stockport.

Headlam, Mrs. Cecil., Broadmead, Charing, Kent.
Heriot, D. B., M.A., Ph.D., 21 Melrose Avenue, Rutherglen, Glasgow.

Inglis, D., M.A., County House, Brecon.

James, A. W., B.A., St. Swithin's House, Lewes.
Jarvis, R. C., Chilton Chase, North Street, Nazeing, Essex.
Jones, E. W., 54 Walker Road, Blackley Estate, Manchester, 9.

Kelley, Miss L. W., M.A., 6 Campden House Mews, W.8.

Lea, R. S., M.A., 237 Latimer Court, W.6.
Lewis, F. R., M.A., D.Phil., Gorphwysfa, Aberystwyth.

Manton, J. O., Bourtonville, Buckingham.
Mathews, E. F. J., Eastlea, 56 Wimborne Road, Poole.
Mills, H. J., M.A., B.Sc., 15 Worbeck Road, S.E.20.

Newman, F. H., Netley, Gaping Lane, Hitchin.
Nicholls, R. E., M.A., Ph.D., Glenholm, Hook Road, Surbiton, Surrey.

Otway-Ruthven, Miss A. J., B.A., Cloragh House, Ashford, Co. Wicklow.

Price, S. J., Westbury, Creswich Road, W.3.

Radford, Miss C., 2 Pennsylvania Park, Exeter.
Reeve, H. F., 24 Gold Top, Newport.
Riley, H. G., A.R.I.B.A., Foxton, Market Harborough.

Sanders, I. J., M.A., 51 Salisbury Road, Cardiff.
Scroggs, Miss E. S., 12 Vicarage Gate, W.8.
Slegg, W. B., The Cedars, Harling, Norwich.
Smith-Masters, Rev. J. E., M.A., Byeways, Andover Road, Newbury.

Thorne, S. A., M.A., LL.B., North Western University School of Law, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.

Waters, S. H., M.A., 5 Belmont Road, Wakefield.
Williams, E. T., B.A., Merton College, Oxford.

HONORARY FELLOWS.

Kenyon, Sir Frederic G., G.B.E., K.C.B., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A., F.S.A., Kirkstead, Godstone, Surrey.

* Lyte, Sir H. C. Maxwell, K.C.B., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A., 61 Warwick Square, S.W.1.

* Poole, Reginald L., LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A., 19 Banbury Road, Oxford.

CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.

Almkvist, Professor Johan, Nybrogatan 7, Stockholm, Sweden.
Altamira y Crevea, Professor R., Lagasca 105, Madrid, Spain.
Andrews, Professor C. M., Ph.D., Litt.D., LL.D., Yale University, New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.

Bémont, Charles, D.Litt., 14 Rue Monsieur le Prince, Paris (VI^e), France.
Birkenmajer, Professor Aleksander, Ph.D., Dept. of MSS., University Library, Cracow, Poland.
Botha, Graham C., M.A., Archive Department, Houses of Parliament, Cape Town, South Africa.
Brandt, Professor K., Dr.Phil., Litt.D., The University, Göttingen, Germany.

Cheney, Emeritus Professor E. P., A.M., LL.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., U.S.A.
Colenbrander, Professor H. J., Dr.Phil., The University, Leiden, Holland.
Cuvelier, Dr. J., Archiviste General du Royaume, Avenue des Rogations 45, Brussels, Belgium.

Delehaye, Père Hippolyte, D.Litt.(Oxon), Société des Bollandistes, Boulevard Saint Michel 24, Brussels, Belgium.
Dembinski, Professor Bronislaw, Dr.Phil., The University, Pozen, Poland.
Dopsch, Professor Alfons, Dr.Phil., The University, Vienna, Austria.

Halecki, Professor Oskar, Dr.Phil., The University, Warsaw, Poland.
Handelsman, Professor Marceli, Ph.D., The University, Warsaw, Poland.
Hannay, Professor R. K., M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.E., 5 Royal Terrace, Edinburgh.
Hayden, Professor Mary T., M.A., 26 Cambridge Road, Upper Rathmines, Dublin.

* Honorary Life Fellows under By-law IV. (since repealed).

Holtzmann, Professor R., Ph.D., Am Schlachtensee 145, Berlin-Nikolassee, Germany.
Horváth, Professor E., Phil.D., II, Ilona útca 4, Francis Joseph Institute, Budapest, Hungary.
Huizinga, Professor J., Ph.D., The University, Leiden, Holland.

Iorga, N., Ph.D., Chaussée Bonaparte 6, Bucharest, Roumania.

Kehr, Professor Paul F., Dr.Phil., Kaiser Wilhelm's Institut, Charlottenstrasse 41, Berlin N.W.7, Germany.
Koht, Professor H., Dr.Phil., Litt.D., The University, Oslo, Norway.

Linvald, Professor Axel, Keeper of the Archives, Norgesmindevej 20 Copenhagen, Hellerup, Denmark.
Lloyd, Professor Sir John, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A., Gwaen Deg, Bangor, Wales.
Lot, Professor F., D.-ès-L., Faculté des Lettres, The University, Paris, France.

McIlwain, Professor C. H., Ph.D., LL.D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.
Meinecke, Professor Friedrich, Dr. Phil et jur., The University, Berlin, Germany.
Meyer, Professor A. O., Ph.D., Wilhelmstrasse 14, Berlin-Lichterfelde-Ost, Germany.
Michael, Emeritus Professor Wolfgang, Ph.D., Hon. LL.D.(Edinburgh), Maria Theresiastrasse 3, Freiburg (Breisgau), Germany.

Pagès, Professor Georges, Faculté des Lettres, The University, Paris, France.
Petit-Dutaillis, Charles, D.-ès-L., Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Paris, France.
Pribram, Professor A. F., D.Phil., The University, Vienna, Austria.

Ravenell, H. E., A.B., A.M., 430 East Main Street, Spartanburg, South Carolina, U.S.A.
Re, Emilio, Cav. Dr., Archivio di Stato, Rome, Italy.

Sarkar, Sir Jadunath, C.I.E., M.A., Sarkar-abas, Darjiling, Bengal, India.
Sarolea, Prof. Charles, K.O.L., LL.D., Litt.D., 21 Royal Terrace, Edinburgh.
Srbik, Professor Heinrich Ritter von, Dr.Phil., The University, Vienna, Austria.
Susta, Professor Josef, Dr. Phil., Charles University, Prague, Czecho-Slovakia.

Uriburu, Señor J. E., Parera 78, Buenos Aires, Argentine, South America.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBING LIBRARIES.

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

Aberdeen University.
Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales.
  University College of Wales.

Bangor, University College of North Wales.
Bath, Municipal Library.
Belfast, The Queen's University.
Birkenhead Public Library.
Birmingham Library, Margaret Street.
Birmingham Public Libraries (Reference Library).
  University.
Bolton Central Reference Library, Town Hall Square.
Bradford Public Library, Darley Street.
Brighton Public Library, Royal Pavilion.
Bristol Central Library.
  University.

Cambridge, Girton College.
  King's College.
  Newnham College.
  Peterhouse.
  St. Catharine's College.
  St. John's College.
  The Seeley Historical Library, The Old Schools.
  University Library.
Canterbury, Dean and Chapter Library.
Cardiff Public Library.
Carlisle Public Library, Castle Street, Carlisle.
Cork, University College.
Coventry, Gulson (Central) Library.

Downside Abbey, *see* Stratton-on-the-Fosse.
Dublin, King's Inns Library.
  National Library of Ireland, Kildare Street.
  Royal Irish Academy, 19 Dawson Street.
  Trinity College.
Durham University.

Edinburgh, Signet Library.
  National Library of Scotland.
  Public Library.
  Record Office.
  University Library.
Englefield Green, Surrey, Royal Holloway College.
Exeter University College Library.

Glasgow. Baillie's Institution, 153 West Regent Street.
    Faculty of Procurators Library, 68 St. George's Place.
    Mitchell Library.
    University Library.
Gloucester Public Library, Brunswick Road.
Grimsby Public Library.

Hawarden, St. Deiniol's Library
Hove Public Library.
Hull, University College.

Leeds Library, Commercial Street, Leeds.
    Public Library.
    The University.
Leicester Municipal Library, Wellington Street.
Liverpool, Athenæum, Church Alley.
    Public Library.
    University.
London, The Admiralty Library, S.W.1.
    The Athenæum Club, Pall Mall, S.W.1.
    Battersea Public Libraries, Lavender Hill, S.W.11.
    Bedford College for Women, Regent's Park, N.W.8.
    Birkbeck College, Bream's Buildings, Chancery Lane, W.C.2.
    British Museum, W.C.1.
    Chelsea Public Library, Manresa Road, S.W.3.
    Chiswick Public Library, Duke's Avenue, W.4.
    Conservative Club, St. James's Street, S.W.1.
    Finsbury Public Library, Skinner Street, E.C.1.
    Fulham Public Library, 598 Fulham Road, S.W.6.
    Gray's Inn Library, W.C.1.
    Guildhall Library, King Street, E.C.2.
    Hampstead Central Public Library, Finchley Road, N.W.8.
    Hendon Public Library, The Burroughs, N.W.4.
    House of Commons Library, S.W.1.
    House of Lords Library, S.W.1.
    Inner Temple Library, E.C.4.
    Institute of Historical Research, Malet Street, Bloomsbury, W.C.1.
    Kensington Public Library, High Street, W.8.
    King's College Library, Strand, W.C.2.
    The Law Society Library, Chancery Lane, W.C.2.
    Leyton Public Library, High Road, E.10.
    Lincoln's Inn Library, W.C.2.
    London Library, St. James's Square, S.W.1.
    London School of Economics and Political Science, Houghton Street, Aldwych, W.C.2.
    London University, South Kensington, S.W.7.
    Middle Temple Library, E.C.4.
    National Portrait Gallery, S.W.1.
    New University Club, St. James's Street, S.W.1.
    The Oratory, Brompton Road, South Kensington, S.W.1.
    Oxford and Cambridge Club, 71 Pall Mall, S.W.1.

London, Public Record Office, W.C.2.
  Reform Club, 104 Pall Mall, S.W.1.
  Royal Holloway College, Englefield Green, Surrey.
  Royal Institution, 21 Albemarle Street, W.1.
  Royal Societies Club, 63 St. James's Street, S.W.1.
  St. George's Public Library, Buckingham Palace Road, S.W.1.
  Sion College Library, Victoria Embankment, S.W.1.
  Southwark Central Library, Walworth Road, S.E.17.
  Stoke Newington Public Library, Church Street, N.16.
  United University Club, 1 Suffolk Street, S.W.1.
  University College Library, Gower Street, W.C.1.
  Westfield College Library, Hampstead, N.W.3.
  Dr. Williams's Library, 14 Gordon Square, W.C.1.

Manchester, The John Rylands Library.
  Public Libraries.
Middlesbrough Free Library, Municipal Buildings.
Mirfield, House of the Resurrection.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne Literary and Philosophical Society.
  Public Library.
Newport (Mon.), Public Library.
Norfolk and Norwich Library, Guildhall Hill, Norwich.
Nottingham Public Reference Library.
  University College.

Oldham, Union Street Library.
Oxford, All Souls College.
  Balliol College.
  Bodleian Library.
  Exeter College.
  Jesus College.
  Keble College.
  Magdalen College.
  Manchester College.
  Merton College.
  Oriel College.
  St. John's College.
  Somerville College.
  The Queen's College.
  Union Society.

Plymouth, The Athenæum, George Street.
Preston Library (Dr. Shepherd's).

Reading Free Public Library, Blagrave Street.

St. Andrews University.
Sheffield Public Library.
Southampton, University College.
Stafford, William Salt Public Library.
Stonyhurst College, Whalley, Lancs.
Stratton-on-the-Fosse, near Bath, Downside Abbey.
Swansea University College, Singleton Park.

Wigan Public Library.
Wimbledon Public Library, S.W.19.
Windsor Royal Library, Windsor Castle.
Workington Public Library.

York Public Library.
Yorkshire Architectural and Archæological Society, c/o Rev. Angelo Rains, Dringhouses, York.

BRITISH DOMINIONS AND INDIA.

Adelaide (South Australia), Public Library.
  University Library.
Allahabad (India), University Library.
Auckland (New Zealand), University Library.

Bombay (India), University Library.
Brisbane (Australia), Public Library of Queensland.
  University of Queensland.
Bulawayo, Rhodesia (South Africa), Public Library.

Canberra (Australia), Library of the Parliament of the Commonwealth.
Cape Town (South Africa), South African Library.
Colombo (Ceylon), University College.

Dunedin (New Zealand), Otago University Library.

Egypt, The Egyptian University Library, Orman Gardens, Giza, B.

Grahamstown (South Africa), Rhodes University College Library.

Halifax (Nova Scotia), Legislative Library.

Johannesburg (South Africa), Public Library.

Lahore (India), University of the Punjab.
London (Canada), University of Western Ontario.
Lucknow (India), Isabella Thoburn College.

Melbourne (Australia), University Central Library.
  Public Library.
Montreal (Canada), Civic Library, 1210 Sherbrooke Street E.
  McGill University Library, 3459 McTavish Street.

Ottawa (Canada), Library of Parliament.

Perth (West Australia), Public Library.
Pretoria (South Africa), State Library.

Sydney (Australia), Public Library, Parliament Buildings.
  University Library.

Toronto (Canada), Legislative Library of Ontario, Parliament Buildings.
  Public Library, College and St. George Street.

Valletta (Malta), The Royal Malta Library.
Victoria (British Columbia, Canada), Provincial Library.

Wellington (New Zealand), General Assembly Library.
  Victoria University Library.

FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

BELGIUM.

Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale.
Gand, Bibliothèque de l'Université, 2 Fosse d'Othon.

CHINA.

Peking, The National Library (Periodical Division), 1 Wen Chin, Chieh.

DENMARK.

Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliothek.

FRANCE.

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale.
Institut de France.
Université de Paris.
Strasbourg, Bibliothèque Nationale et Universitaire, 6 Place de la République.

GERMANY.

Berlin, Preussische Staats-Bibliothek.
Bonn, Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Freiburg, i. Br. Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Göttingen, Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Greifswald, Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Halle, Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Hamburg, Freien und Hausestadt Bibliothek.
Heidelberg, Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Jena, Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Leipzig, Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Marburg, Universitäts-Bibliothek.
Münich, Bayer Staats-Bibliothek.
Würzburg, Universitäts-Bibliothek.

ITALY.

Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.

NORWAY.

Oslo, The University Library.

POLAND.

Warsaw, Biblioteka Ministerstwo Spraw Zagranicznych.

SWEDEN.

Göteborg, Stads Bibliotek.
Lund, K. Universitets-Biblioteket.
Stockholm, Kungl. Bibliotek.
Uppsala, K. Universitetets-Biblioteket.

SWITZERLAND.

Basel, Universitäts Bibliothek, Schonbeinstrasse, 20.

UNITED STATES.

Albany (N.Y.), New York State Library.
Amherst (Mass.), Amherst College Library.
Ann Arbor (Mich.), Michigan University Library.
Austin (Texas), Texas University.

Baltimore (Md.), Enoch Pratt Library.
    Johns Hopkins University Library.
    Peabody Institute Library.
Berkeley (Cal.), California University Library.
Bethlehem (Pa.), Lehigh University Library.
Bloomington (Ind.), Indiana University Library.
Boston (Mass.), Athenæum.
    Public Library.
Brunswick (Me.), Bowdoin College Library.
Bryn Mawr (Pa.), Bryn Mawr College Library.
Buffalo (N.Y.), Grosvenor Public Library.

Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard University Library.
    Harvard Law School Library.
Chapel Hill (N.C.), University of North Carolina.
Charlottesville (Va.), University of Virginia Library.
Chicago (Ill.), Newberry Library.
    University Library (Order Section W. 21).
Cincinnati (Ohio), Public Library.
Cleveland (Ohio), Public Library, 325 Superior Avenue, N.E.
Clinton (N.Y.), Hamilton College Library.
Columbus (Ohio), State University Library.

Detroit (Mich.), Public Library.
Durham (N. Car.), Duke University.

Eugene (Oregon), University of Oregon.
Evanston (Ill.), North Western University.

Fordham (N.Y.), Fordham University.

Grand Rapids (Mass.), Public Library.

Hanover (N.H.), Dartmouth College Library.
Haverford (Pa.), Haverford College Library.
Houston (Texas), Rice Institute Library.

Ithaca (N.Y.), Cornell University Library.

Jersey City (N.J.), Free Public Library, 472–486 Jersey Avenue.

Lawrence (Kans.), Kansas University Library.
Lincoln (Neb.), Nebraska University Library.
Los Angeles (Cal.), Public Library, 35 South Hope Street.
    University of California, 405 Hilgard Avenue.

Madison (Wis.), State Historical Society of Wisconsin.
Milwaukee (Wis.), Public Library.
Minneapolis (Minn.), Athenæum Library.
  Minnesota University Library.
Mundelein (Ill.), Feehan Memorial Library, St. Mary of the Lake Seminary.

Nashville (Tenn.), Vanderbilt University.
Newark (N.J.), Free Public Library, 5 Washington Street.
New Haven (Conn.), Yale University Library.
New Orleans (La.), Tulane University Library.
New York (N.Y.), Columbia University Library.
  General Theological Seminary Library, 175 Ninth Avenue.
  Public Library.
  University, Washington Square Library, 32 Waverley Place.
Northampton (Mass.), Smith College Library.

Philadelphia (Pa.), Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1300 Locust Street.
  Library Company of Philadelphia.
  Pennsylvania University Library.
  St. Clement's Library, Locust Street at Forty Second.
Pittsburg (Pa.), Carnegie Library (The Periodical Room), 4400 Forbes Street.
Poughkeepsie (N.Y.), Vassar College Library.
Princeton (N.J.), Princeton University Library.
Providence (R.I.), Brown University Library.

Richmond (Va.), Virginia State Library.
Rochester (N.Y.), The Rush Rees Library, University of Rochester.

St. Louis (Mo.), Public Library.
  University Library, Grand and Pine Boulevards.
  Washington University.
San Francisco (Cal.), Public Library, Civic Center.
San Marino (Cal.), Huntington Library.
Seattle (D.C.), University of Washington.
South Hadley (Mass.), Mount Holyoke College Library.
Stanford (Cal.), University Library.

Terre Haute (Ind.), Indiana State Normal School Library.

Urbana (Ill.), Illinois University Library.

Washington (D.C.), Catholic University of America.
Wellesley (Mass.), Wellesley College Library.
Williamstown (Mass.), Williams College Library.
Winona (Minn.), College of Saint Teresa.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

WHICH EXCHANGE TRANSACTIONS WITH THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

Society of Antiquaries, Burlington House, London, W.1.
Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland, 63 Merrion Square, Dublin.
Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, Queen Street, Edinburgh.
The Hon. Society of Cymmrodorion, 20 Bedford Square, W.C.1.
Surrey Archæological Society, Castle Arch, Guildford.
Jewish Historical Society, Mocatta Library, University College, Gower Street, W.C.1.
The University, Manchester.
Thoroton Society, Bromley House, Angel Row, Nottingham.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES ABROAD

WHICH EXCHANGE TRANSACTIONS WITH THE SOCIETY.

AUSTRALIA.

Royal Australian Historical Society, Department of Education Offices, Bridge Street, Sydney.

BELGIUM.

Académie Royale d'Archéologie de Belgique, Rue de Witte, 59, Antwerp.
Académie Royale de Belgique, Commission Royale d'Histoire, Palais des Academies, Rue Ducale, 1, Brussels.
Archives, Hotel de Ville, Antwerp.
Revue Bénédictine, Abbaye de Maredsous, par Maredret-Sosoye.

CANADA.

Nova Scotia Historical Society, Halifax, Nova Scotia.
Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa.
Toronto University.

FRANCE.

Bibliothèque de l'Université de Toulouse, 2 Rue de l'Université, Toulouse, Haute-Garonne.
Société de l'École Nationale des Chartes, 19 Rue de la Sorbonne, Paris.
Société de l'Histoire de France, 60 Rue des Francs-Bourgeois, Paris.

GERMANY.

Deutsch-Ausländische Buchtausch Unter der Linden, 38, Berlin, N.W.7.
Hansischer Geschichtsverein, Staats Archiv, Königstrasse 21, Lübeck.

HOLLAND.

Commissie van Advies voor Rijks Geschied-kundige Publicatien, The Hague.
Historisch Genootschap, Utrecht.

POLAND.

Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Varsoire, Universitets, Lwow.

SPAIN.

Real Academia de la Historia, Calle del Leon 21, Madrid.

SWITZERLAND.

Allgemeine Geschichtsforschende Gesellschaft der Schweiz. Stadt Bibliothek, Berne.

UNITED STATES.

American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Mass.
American Jewish Historical Society, 3080 Broadway, New York.
Connecticut Historical Society, Hartford, Conn.
Illinois Historical Society, Springfield, Illinois.
Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
Maine Historical Society, Portland, Maine, U.S.A.
Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, Md.
Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, Mass.
New England Historic-Genealogical Society, 9 Ashburton Place, Boston, Mass.
New Jersey Historical Society, 16 West Park Street, Newark, N.J.
New Hampshire State Library, Concord, N.H.
New York Historical Society, 77 Street and Central Park West, New York.
Virginia Historical Society, 707 East Franklin Street, Richmond, Va.

The Council are not responsible for the accuracy of the foregoing list, but they request that any inaccuracy or omission may be pointed out to the Secretary, and that all changes of address may be notified to him, so that delay in forwarding communications and the Publications of the Society may be avoided.

TRANSACTIONS AND PUBLICATIONS

OF THE

ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.*

1. TRANSACTIONS.

Transactions. Old Series 1872–1882. Vols. I to X † (vols. I, II and III *out of print*).
Transactions. New Series, 1884–1906. Vols. I to XX.
Third Series, 1907–1917. Vols. I to XI.
Fourth Series, 1918–1935. Vols. I to XIX.
Domesday Studies, 2 vols. 1886. 24s.‡
Edited for the Domesday Commemoration Committee by P. E. Dove.

2. MISCELLANEOUS PUBLICATIONS.

OLD SERIES.

England and Napoleon in 1803. Being the Despatches of Lord Whitworth and others. Edited by Oscar Browning, M.A. 8vo. 1887. 7s. 6d.

Walter of Henley's Husbandry, together with an anonymous Husbandry, Seneschaucie, and Robert Grosseteste's Rules. Edited by E. Lamond and W. Cunningham, D.D., Litt.D. 4to. 1890. 12s.

The Domesday of Inclosures, 1517–1518. Edited by I. S. Leadam, M.A. 2 vols. 1897. 30s.

Bibliographies of the Right Hon. and Right Rev. Mandell Creighton, Bishop of London, the Right Rev. William Stubbs, Bishop of Oxford, Dr. S. R. Gardiner, and the Right Hon. John, Baron Acton. Edited by W. A. Shaw, Litt.D. 8vo. 1903. 5s.

* These are usually only issued to Fellows, Associates, and Subscribing Libraries, but copies of the Magna Carta Commemoration Essays and the Repertory of English Archives will be supplied on application and the *Bibliographies* and *Writings* may be obtained from the publishers. The price of the current number of the *Transactions* is 15s. Back numbers, Fourth Series, 10s.; Third Series, 10s.; New Series, 10s.; Old Series, 7s. 6d.; except Fourth Series, Vol. 7; Third Series, Vol. 9; Old Series, Vols. 4, 5, 7, 9, 10. These can only be supplied by special leave of the Council. Applications together with the postage should be addressed to the Librarian, Royal Historical Society, 96 Cheyne Walk, S.W.10.

† The earlier volumes of this Series were issued to Fellows in unbound parts. Any discrepancies in the lettering of bound volumes during this period are doubtless due to this circumstance.

‡ These two volumes and the two guides to the Domesday and Gibbon Commemorations referred to below were planned by the respective Commemoration committees and their publication was taken over by the Royal Historical Society.

Domesday Commemoration, 1886. Notes on the Manuscripts, etc., exhibited at H.M. Public Record Office. Vellum, 4to. 5s. per volume.

Gibbon Commemoration, 1894, Proceedings of the. Vellum, 4to. 5s.

Catalogue of the Library of the Royal Historical Society, 1915.

German Opinion and German Policy before the War. By G. W. Prothero, LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A., V.-P. R.Hist.S. 1916. 4s.

Magna Carta Commemoration Essays. With Preface by the Right Hon. Viscount Bryce, O.M., F.B.A. Edited by H. E. Malden, M.A. 25s.

A Repertory of English Archives. Compiled by Hubert Hall, Litt.D., F.S.A., *Director*, assisted by Research Students of the University of London. 1920. 10s. 6d.

A List and Index of the Transactions and Publications of the Royal Historical Society (1869–1924) and of the Publications of the Camden Society (1840–1897). Edited by Hubert Hall, Litt.D., F.S.A., *Director*. 1925. 5s.

ISSUED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

Bibliography of British History. Tudor Period, 1485–1603. Edited by Conyers Read, Ph.D., 1933. 20s. 9d.

Bibliography of British History. Stuart Period, 1603–1714. Edited by Godfrey Davies, M.A., 1928. 16s. 6d.

Bibliography of British History. 1714–1789. Edited by Professor D. J. Medley and S. M. Pargellis. (*In preparation*).

3. PUBLICATIONS OF THE LATE CAMDEN SOCIETY, CONTINUED (FROM 1897) AS THE CAMDEN SERIES OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY.†

OLD SERIES.

*1. Historie of the Arrivall of Edward IV. in England (1471). Edited by J. Bruce.

*2. Kynge Johan. A Play in two Parts. By John Bale. Edited by J. P. Collier.

*3. Alliterative Poem on Deposition of Richard II.; Ricardi Madiston de Concordia inter. Ric. II. et Civitatem London. Edited by T. Wright.

*4. Plumpton Correspondence. Letters written in the reigns of Edward IV., Richard III., Henry VII., and Henry VIII. Edited by Stapleton.

*5. Anecdotes and Traditions, illustrative of Early English History and Literature. Edited by W. J. Thoms.

*6. The Political Songs of England, from the reign of John to Edward II. Edited and translated by T. Wright.

*7. Annals of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, by Sir J. Hayward. Edited by J. Bruce.

8. Ecclesiastical Documents: viz.—1. A Brief History of the Bishoprick of Somerset from its Foundation to 1174. 2. Charters from the Library of Dr. Cox Macro. Published by the Rev. J. Hunter.

*9. Speculi Britanniæ Pars: an historical and geographical Description of Essex, by John Norden, 1594. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

*10. A Chronicle of the First Thirteen Years of the reign of Edward IV., by John Warkworth, D.D. Edited by J. O. Halliwell.

† These are only issued to Fellows and Subscribing Libraries whose subscriptions are fully paid. A few are out of print, and of some others which are marked with an asterisk, but a few copies remain, and these can only be supplied by special leave of the Council. The remainder may be had at the following prices:—

Old Series, from 6s.
New Series, from 7s. 6d.
Third Series, from 10s.
Current volumes, 15s. each.
Diplomatic Correspondence Series, Camden Third Series, vols. 32, 35, 36, 38, 39, 43, and 49, 17s. 6d. each.

Associates are entitled to purchase one copy of each at a reduction of 25 per cent.

Applications together with the postage should be addressed to the Librarian, Royal Historical Society, 96 Cheyne Walk, London, S.W.10.

*11. Kemp's Nine Daies Wonder, performed in a Daunce from London to Norwich. Edited by Rev. A. Dyce.

*12. The Egerton Papers. Temp. Elizabeth and James I. Edited by J. P. Collier.

*13. Chronica Jocelini de Brakelonda, de rebus gestis Samsonis Abbatis Monasterii Sancti Edmundi. Edited by J. G. Rokewode.

*14. Narratives of the Contests in Ireland in 1641 and 1690. Edited by T. C. Croker.

*15. The Chronicle of William de Rishanger, of the Barons' Wars, and the Miracles of Simon de Montfort. Edited by J. O. Halliwell.

16. The Latin Poems commonly attributed to Walter Mapes. Edited by T. Wright.

17. The Second Book of the Travels of Nicander Nucius, of Corcyra. Edited by Rev. J. A. Cramer.

18. Three Early English Metrical Romances. Edited by J. Robson.

19. The Private Diary of Dr. John Dee, and the Catalogue of his Library of Manuscripts. Edited by J. O. Halliwell.

*20. An Apology for Lollard Doctrines, attributed to Wicliffe. Edited by J. H. Todd.

21. Rutland Papers. Original Documents illustrative of the Courts and Times of Henry VII. and Henry VIII. Edited by W. Jerdan.

22. The Diary of Dr. Thomas Cartwright, Bishop of Chester, from August 1686, to October, 1687. Printed from the original MS. of the Rev. J. Hunter.

23. Original Letters of Eminent Literary Men of the Sixteenth, Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

24. A Contemporary Narrative of the Proceedings against Dame Alice Kyteler, prosecuted for Sorcery in 1324, by Richard de Ledrede, Bishop of Ossory. Edited by T. Wright.

*25. Promptorium Parvulorum sive Clericorum, Lexicon Anglo-Latinum Princeps auctore fratre Galfrido Grammatico dicto, e Predicatoribus Lenne Episcopi, Northfolciensi, A.D. circa 1440. Edited by A. Way. Part I. (*See* Nos. 54 and 89.)

*26. Three Chapters of Letters relating to the Suppression of Monasteries. Edited by T. Wright.

27. Correspondence of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leycester, 1585 and 1586. Edited by J. Bruce.

28. The French Chronicle of London. Depuis l'an 44 Hen. III. jusqu'à l'an 17 Edw. III. Edited by G. J. Aungier.

29. Three Books of Polydore Vergil's English History, comprising the Reigns of Henry VI., Edward IV., and Richard III. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

30. The Thornton Romances. The Early English Metrical Romances of Perceval, Isumbras, Eglamour, and Degravant. Edited by J. O. Halliwell.

31. Verney Papers. Notes of Proceedings in the Long Parliament, temp. Charles I. Edited by J. Bruce.

32. The Autobiography of Sir John Bramston, K.B., of Skreens, in the Hundred of Chelmsford. Printed from the MS. of T. W. Bramston.

33. Letters from James, Earl of Perth, Lord Chancellor of Scotland, etc., to his Sister the Countess of Erroll, and other members of his Family. Edited by W. Jerdan.

34. De Antiquis Legibus Liber. Cronica Maiorum et Vicecomitum Londoniarum, 1178 to 1274. By T. Stapleton.

35. The Chronicle of Calais, in the reigns of Henry VII. and Henry VIII., to 1540. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

36. Polydore Vergil's English History, prior to the Norman Conquest. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

37. A Relation, or rather a True Account, of the Isle of England, about 1500. Translated from the Italian by Charlotte Augusta Sneyd.

38. Documents relative to the Foundation and Antiquities of the Collegiate Church of Middleham, Co. York, and notices of the Castle and Town. Edited by Rev. W. Atthill.

39. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. I.: 1. Register and Chronicle of the Abbey of Aberconway. Edited by Sir H. Ellis. 2. Chronicle of the Rebellion in Lincolnshire, 1470. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 3. Bull of Pope Innocent VIII., on the Marriage of Henry VII. with Elizabeth of York. Communicated by J. P. Collier. 4. Journal of the Siege of Rouen, 1591. By Sir T. Coningsby. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 5. Letter from George Fleetwood to his Father, giving an account of the Battle of Lutzen. Edited by Sir P. de Malpas Grey Egerton, Bart. 6. Diary of Dr. Edward Lake, Archdeacon and Prebendary of Exeter, etc., in 1677 and 1678. Edited by G. P. Elliott.

40. A Commentary of the Services and Charges of William Lord Grey of Wilton, by his son Arthur Lord Grey of Wilton. Edited by Sir P. de Malpas Grey Egerton, Bart.

41. Diary of Walter Yonge, Justice of the Peace, and M.P. for Honiton, 1604 to 1628. Edited by G. Roberts.

42. The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant Taylor of London, from 1550 to 1563. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

43. The Visitation of the County of Huntingdon under the authority of William Camden, Clarenceux King of Arms, 1613. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

44. The Obituary of Richard Smyth, Secondary of the Poultry Compter, London, 1627 to 1674. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

45. Certaine Considerations upon the Government of England. By Sir Roger Twysden, Kt. and Bart. Edited by J. M. Kemble.

46. Letters of Queen Elizabeth and James VI. of Scotland. Edited by J. Bruce.

47. Chronicon Petroburgense. Edited by T. Stapleton.

48. The Chronicle of Queen Jane, and two years of Queen Mary. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

49. Wills and Inventories, from the Registers of the Commissary of Bury St. Edmunds and the Archdeacon of Sudbury. Edited by S. Tymms.

50. Gualteri Mapes de Nugis Curialium Distinctiones quinque. Edited by T. Wright.

51. The Pylgrymage of Sir Richard Guylforde to the Holy Land, 1506. Edited by Sir H. Ellis.

52. Moneys received and paid for Secret Services of Charles II. and James II., 1679 to 1688. Edited by J. Y. Akerman.

*53. Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

54. Promptorium Parvulorum. Vol. II. (*See* Nos. 25 and 89.)

*55. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. II.: 1. Account of the Expenses of John of Brabant and Henry and Thomas of Lancaster, 1292–3. Edited by J. Burtt. 2. Household Expenses of the Princess Elizabeth at Hatfield, 1551–2. Edited by Viscount Strangford. 3. The Request and Suite of a True-hearted Englishman written by William Cholmley, Londyner, in 1553. Edited by W. J. Thoms. 4. The Discovery of the Jesuits' College in Clerkenwell in March, 1627–8. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 5. Trelawny Papers. Edited by W. D. Cooper. 6. Autobiography and Anecdotes, by William Taswell, D.D. Edited by G. P. Elliott.

56. Letters and Papers of the Verney Family, to the end of 1639. Edited by J. Bruce. (*Out of print.*)

57. The Ancren Riwle. Rules and duties of Monastic Life. Edited by J. Morton, B.D. (*Out of print.*)

58. Letters of the Lady Brilliana Harley. Edited by T. T. Lewis.

59. Household Expenses of Richard de Swinfield, Bishop of Hereford, 1289–90. (*See* No. 62.) (*Out of print.*)

60. Grants, etc., from the Crown during the reign of Edward V. and two Speeches for opening Parliament, by John Russell, Bishop of Lincoln, Lord Chancellor. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

61. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. III.: 1. Papers relating to Proceedings in Co. Kent, 1642–1646. Edited by R. Almack. 2. Ancient Biographical Poems, on the Duke of Norfolk, Viscount Hereford, the Earl of Essex, and Queen Elizabeth. Edited by J. P. Collier. 3. A Relation of some Abuses which are committed against the Common-Wealth, 1629. Edited by Sir F. Madden, K.H. 4. Inventories of the Wardrobes, etc., of Henry FitzRoy, Duke of Richmond. And of Katherine, Princess Dowager at Baynard's Castle. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

62. Household Book of Bishop Swinfield. Vol. II. (*See* No. 59.)

63. Letters of Charles I. to Queen Henrietta Maria. Edited by J. Bruce.

64. An English Chronicle of the reigns of Richard II., Henry IV., Henry V., and Henry VI. Edited by Rev. J. S. Davies, M.A.

65. The Knights Hospitallers of England, 1338. Edited by Rev. L. B. Larking, M.A.

66. Diary of John Rous, Incumbent of Santon Downham, Suffolk, from 1625 to 1642. Edited by Mary Anne E. Green.

67. Trevelyan Papers prior to 1558. Edited by J. P. Collier. Part I. (*See* Nos. 84 and 105.)

68. Journal of the Very Rev. Rowland Davies, LL.D., Dean of Ross 1688–1690. Edited by R. Caulfield, B.A.

69. The Domesday of St. Paul's, 1222; or Registrum de Visitatione Maneriorum per Robertum Decanum, etc. Edited by W. H. Hale.

70. Liber Famelicus of James Whitelocke, a Judge of the King's Bench in the reigns of James I. and Charles I. Edited by J. Bruce.

71. Savile Correspondence. Temp. Charles II. and James II. Edited by W. D. Cooper.

72. The Romance of Blonde of Oxford and Jehan of Dammartin. By Philippe de Reimes, a Trouvère of the Thirteenth Century. Edited by M. Le Roux de Lincy.

73. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. IV.: 1. A London Chronicle during the reigns of Henry VII. and Henry VIII. Edited by C. Hopper. 2. The Expenses of the Judges of Assize riding in the Western and Oxford Circuits, 1596–1601. Edited by W. D. Cooper. 3. The Skryvener's Play, The Incredulity of St. Thomas. Edited by J. P. Collier. 4. The Childe of Bristowe, a Poem by John Lydgate. Edited by C. Hopper. 5. Sir Edw. Lake's Account of his Interviews with Charles I. on being created a Baronet. Edited by T. P. Langmead. 6. The Letters of Pope to Atterbury, when in the Tower of London. Edited by J. G. Nichols. 7. Supplementary Note to the Discovery of the Jesuits' College in March, 1627–8. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

74. Diary of the Marches of the Royal Army during the great Civil War, kept by Ric. Symonds. Edited by C. E. Long.

75. Original Papers illustrative of the Life and Writings of John Milton. Edited by W. D. Hamilton.

76. Letters of George Lord Carew to Sir Thomas Roe, Ambassador to the Court of the Great Mogul, 1615–1617. Edited by J. Maclean.

77. Narratives of the Days of the Reformation. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

78. Correspondence of James VI. of Scotland with Sir Robert Cecil and others in England, temp. Elizabeth. Edited by J. Bruce.

79. Letters written by John Chamberlain during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by Sarah Williams.

80. Proceedings, principally in Co. Kent, in connection with the Parliaments called in 1640. Edited by Rev. L. B. Larking.

81. Parliamentary Debates in 1610. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D.

82. Lists of Foreign Protestants, and Aliens, resident in England, 1618-1688. Edited by W. D. Cooper.

83. Wills from Doctors' Commons, 1495–1695. Edited by J. G. Nichols.

84. Trevelyan Papers. Part II. 1446–1643. Edited by J. P. Collier. (*See* Nos. 67 and 105.)

85. The Life of Marmaduke Rawdon of York. Edited by R. Davies.

86. Letters of Queen Margaret of Anjou and Bishop Beckington, and others. Temp. Henry V. and Henry VI. Edited by C. Monro.

87. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. V.: 1. Five Letters of Charles II. Communicated by the Marquis of Bristol. 2. Letter of the Council to Sir Thomas Lake. 3. Documents relating to Sir Walter Raleigh's last voyage. Communicated by S. R. Gardiner. 4. A Catalogue of Early English Miscellanies formerly in the Harleian Library. Edited by W. C. Hazlitt. 5. Letters selected from the collection of Autographs in the possession of William Tite, Esq. 6. Sir Francis Drake's Memorable Service done against the Spaniards in 1587. By Robert Leng, one of his co-adventurers. Edited by C. Hopper. 7. Inquiry into the Genuineness of a Letter dated February 3rd, 1613, signed "Mary Magdaline Davers." (*Out of print.*)

88. Letters from Sir Robert Cecil to Sir George Carew. Edited by J. Maclean.

89. Promptorium Parvulorum. Part III. (*Out of print.*) (*See* Nos. 25 and 54.)

90. Letters and other Documents illustrating the Relations between England and Germany at the commencement of the Thirty Years' War. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. (*See* No. 98.)

91. Registrum sive Liber Irrotularius et Consuetudinarius Prioratus Beatæ Mariæ Wigorniensis. By W. H. Hale.

92. Pope Alexander VII. and the College of Cardinals. By John Bargrave, D.D. Edited by J. C. Robertson.

93. Accounts and Papers relating to Mary Queen of Scots. Edited by A. J. Crosby and J. Bruce.

*94. History from Marble. Compiled in the reign of Charles II. by Thomas Dingley. Printed in Photolithography by Vincent Brooks. Edited by J. G. Nichols. Vol. I. (*See* No. 97.)

95. Manipulus Vocabulorum. A Dictionary of English and Latin Words, by Peter Devins, 1570. Edited by H. B. Wheatley.

96. Journal of a Voyage into the Mediterranean, by Sir Kenelm Digby, 1628. Edited by J. Bruce.

97. History from Marble. Vol. II. (*See* No. 94.) (*Out of print.*)

98. Letters and other Documents illustrating the relations between England and Germany at the commencement of the Thirty Years' War. Second Series. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. (*See* No. 90.)

*99. Diary of John Manningham. 1602–3. Edited by W. Tite.

100. Notes of the Treaty carried on at Ripon between Charles I. and the Covenanters of Scotland, 1640, taken by Sir John Borough, Garter King of Arms. Edited by J. Bruce.

101. El hecho de los Tratados del Matrimonio pretendido por el Principe de Gales con la serenissima Infanta de España Maria, etc. Narrative of the Spanish Marriage Treaty. Edited and translated by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D.

102. Churchwardens' Accounts of the Town of Ludlow, in Shropshire, from 1540 to the end of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by T. Wright.

103. Notes of the Debates of the House of Lords. By Henry Elsing, Clerk of the Parliament, 1621. Edited by S. R. Gardiner.

104. The Camden Miscellany. Vol. VI.: 1. Life of William Whittingham, Dean of Durham. Edited by Mary Anne E. Greene. 2. The Earl of Bristol's Defence of his Negotiations in Spain. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. Journal of Sir Francis Walsingham, December, 1570, to April, 1583. Edited by C. T. Martin.

105. Trevelyan Papers. Part III. Edited by Sir Walter and Sir Charles Trevelyan. (*See* Nos. 67 and 84.)

NEW SERIES.

Vol. 56 onwards were issued after the amalgamation of the two Societies.

1. The Fortescue Papers, principally consisting of letters on State affairs, collected by John Packer, Secretary to George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. Consists chiefly of a miscellaneous collection of letters which were apparently thrown aside by the Duke of Buckingham after he had read them. One Paper is of peculiar importance as relating to Raleigh's trial.

*2. Letters and Papers of John Shillingford, Mayor of Exeter, A.D. 1447–1450. Edited by Stuart A. Moore. Valuable as throwing light on the practical working of our institutions and the administration of the law in the reign of Henry VI.

3. The Cheque Book of the Chapel Royal from the Reign of Elizabeth to the Accession of the House of Hanover. Edited by Dr. Rimbault. Full of notices of English Musicians connected with the Chapel, and of minute particulars of royal ceremonies, funerals, coronations, churchings, baptisms, marriages, etc. (*Out of print.*)

4. A True Relation of the Life and Death of William Bedell, Lord Bishop of Kilmore. Edited by Thomas Wharton Jones, F.R.S. Interesting not only for the light it throws on the working of the Church of Ireland at a most important period in its history, but also for the personal character of Bishop Bedell himself.

5. The Mayor of Bristol's Calendar, by Robert Ricart, Town Clerk of Bristol, temp. Edward IV. Edited by L. Toulmin Smith. Illustrative of municipal antiquities. (*Out of print.*)

6. Notes of Debates in the House of Commons in 1625. Edited from a MS. in the Library of Sir Rainald Knightley, Bart., by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. Throws additional light on the quarrel between Charles I, and the House of Commons, and contains new facts relating to Sir John Eliot.

7. A Military Memoir of Colonel Birch, Governor of Hereford during the Civil War. Edited by the late Rev. John Webb, M.A., F.S.A., and the Rev. T. W. Webb, M.A. A storehouse of curious facts relating to the period of the Civil War.

8 and 9. Letters addressed from London to Sir Joseph Williamson while Plenipotentiary at the Congress of Cologne in the year 1673. Edited by W. D. Christie, C.B. Two vols. Full of news from the Court of Charles II.

10. Account of the Executors of Richard, Bishop of London, 1303, and of the Executors of Thomas, Bishop of Exeter, 1310. Edited by the late Venerable W. H. Hale, M.A., and the Rev. H. T. Ellacombe, M.A., F.S.A. Full of curious details on the household and ecclesiastical furniture of a bishop of the fourteenth century.

11. Wriothesley's Chronicle of English Affairs from the Accession of Henry VII. to the First Year of Queen Elizabeth. Edited from a MS. in the possession of Major-Gen. Lord Henry Percy, by W. D. Hamilton, F.S.A. Two vols. Contains particulars not in other chronicles of the period. The Editor has printed in an Appendix to the First Volume the records of the trial of Anne Boleyn. (*See* No. 20.)

12. Documents relating to the Quarrel between the Earl of Manchester and Oliver Cromwell; with Fragments of a Historical Preface by the late J. Bruce. Annotated and completed by Professor Masson. Gives information about the proceedings of Manchester and Cromwell from the battle of Marston Moor till after the second battle of Newbury, and also the arguments on both sides of the dispute which ensued.

13. Autobiography of Lady Halket, in the reigns of Charles I. and Charles II. Edited by the late John Gough Nichols, F.S.A. The subject is a pious lady of the days of the Commonwealth and the Restoration.

14. The Camden Miscellany, Vol. VII., containing: 1. Two Sermons preached by the Boy-Bishop. Edited by the late J. G. Nichols. With an Introduction by Dr. Rimbault. 2. Speech of Sir Robert Heath in the case of Alexander Leighton. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, with a Preface by the late J. Bruce. 3. Notes of Sir G. Croke's Judgment in the case of Ship Money. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 4. Letters relating to the Mission of Sir T. Roe to Gustavus Adolphus, 1629–1630. Edited by S. R. Gardiner. 5. Accounts of the Expenditure in building Bodmin Church. Edited by the Rev. J. J. Wilkinson, M.A., Rector of Lanteglos.

15. Letters of Dean Prideaux. Edited by E. Maunde Thompson. The letters contain amusing descriptions of life at Oxford and in the country at the close of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century.

*16. Milton's Common Place Book. Edited by A. J. Horwood. It is unnecessary to point out the interest of Milton's notes and jottings on a variety of subjects, political, social, moral, and literary.

17. Historical Collections of a London Citizen in the Fifteenth Century. Edited by James Gairdner. Printed from a MS. The poem is a very graphic original account of the siege of Rouen by Henry V. The chronicle is unique, ending in the middle of Edward IV.'s reign.

*18. Papers relating to the life of William Prynne, with the Fragment of a Biographical Preface by the late J. Bruce. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D.

19. Christ Church Letters relating to the Priory of Christ Church, Canterbury. Edited by J. B. Sheppard. Mostly of the fifteenth century, and some of political importance, relating to embassies, etc.

20. Wriothesley's Chronicle. Vol. II. (*See* No. 11.)

21. Harpsfield's Treatise of the Pretended Divorce between Henry VIII. and Catherine of Aragon. Edited by the Rev. N. Pocock. An early authority for many facts hitherto considered questionable concerning Henry VIII.'s reign, which are now more generally accepted than they were.

22. Correspondence of the Family of Hatton, 1601–1704. Vol. I. Edited by E. M. Thompson. Full of news and gossip. May be taken as a fair sample of the correspondence of a family of the higher classes in the seventeenth century. (*See* No. 23.)

23. The Hatton Correspondence. Vol. II. (*See* No. 22.)

24. Notes of the Debates in the House of Lords officially taken by H. Elsing, 1624 and 1626. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D.

25. The Œconomy of the Fleete. Edited by Dr. A. Jessopp. An account of the state of the Fleet Prison in the time of James I.

26. Documents relating to St. Paul's Cathedral. Edited by the Rev. W. Sparrow Simpson, D.D., F.S.A. Ranging from the thirteenth to the beginning of the eighteenth century.

27. The Hamilton Papers, 1638–1648. Edited from the Originals at Hamilton Palace by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. Important for the history both of England and of Scotland during that troubled period.

28. Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles. Edited by James Gairdner. (*Out of print.*)

29. The Puritan Visitation of the University of Oxford. Edited by Professor Montagu Burrows, F.S.A.

30. Catholicon Anglicum. Edited by Sidney J. Herrtage. A Mediæval Latin Glossary of great interest from a philological point of view.

31. The Camden Miscellany, Vol. VIII., containing: 1. Four letters of the Earl of Stafford, and a Poem on his illness. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. 2. Memoir by Madame de Motteville on the Life of Henrietta Maria. Edited by M. G. Hanotaux. 3. Papers relating to the Delinquency of Thomas Viscount Saville, 1642–1646; Five Letters from Richard Thompson to his brother Henry Thompson, of Escrick, afterwards M.P. for York. Edited by J. J. Cartwright, M.A. 4. Papers relating to Secret Negotiations with Charles I., 1643–1644. Edited by Mrs. B. M. Gardiner. 5. A Letter from

the Earl of Manchester on the conduct of Cromwell; Letters addressed to the Earl of Lauderdale. Edited by Osmund Airy. Letters of the Duke of Monmouth. Edited by Sir George Duckett, Bart. Correspondence of the Family of Haddock, 1657–1719. Edited by Edward Maunde Thompson.

32. The Voyage to Cadiz in 1625. Edited by Dr. Grosart.

33. Diary and Letter Book of Gabriel Harvey, 1573–1580. Edited by Edward J. L. Scott, M.A. Throws light upon University life at Cambridge in the age of Elizabeth.

34. Selections from the Papers of the Duke of Lauderdale, temp. Car. II. Edited by Osmund Airy. Three Volumes. Vol. I. 1639–1667. Vol. II. 1667–1673. Vol. III. 1673–1679. Illustrative of the period of the Restoration in Scotland.

35. Political Memoranda of the Fifth Duke of Leeds. Edited by Oscar Browning, M.A.

36. The Lauderdale Papers. Vol. II. 1667–73. (*See* Nos. 34 and 38.)

37. Papers relating to issue of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. Edited by the Rev. N. Pocock.

38. The Lauderdale Papers. Vol. III. 1673–79. (*See* Nos. 34 and 36.)

39. Proceedings in the Star Chamber and Court of High Commission in the year 1632. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D.

40. The Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State, and of his son, Sir John Nicholas, Clerk to the Privy Council, Vol. I. Edited by George F. Warner, M.A. Supplementary to correspondence printed in Evelyn's Diary, with matter relating to the Court of Charles II. during his exile. (*See* Nos. 50, 57, and Third Series, No. 31.)

41. Custumals of Battle Abbey, temp. Edward I., from a Manuscript in the Public Record Office. Edited by S. R. Scargill Bird, F.S.A. Throws light on the tenure of land and manorial customs in the thirteenth century.

42. Bishop Pococke's Travels in England in 1750, etc. Edited by James J. Cartwright, M.A. Vol. I. (*See* No. 44.)

43. Monastic Visitations in the Diocese of Norwich. Edited by the Rev. Augustus Jessopp, D.D. These visitations show the state of monastic life in the diocese of Norwich on the eve of the Reformation.

44. Bishop Pococke's Travels in England. Vol. II. (*See* No. 42.)

45. Papers relating to the Impeachment of the Duke of Buckingham in 1626. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D.

46. Memoirs relating to Lord Torrington. Edited by John Knox Laughton, M.A., R.N. Illustrative of naval affairs in the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century.

47. The Essex Papers. Vol. I. Edited by Osmund Airy. Contains new matter relating to the Court of Charles II. and to the government of Ireland in his reign. (*See* Third Series, No. 24.)

48. Visitations of the Collegiate Church of Southwell. Edited by A. F. Leach, M.A., F.S.A. A set of visitations differing in character from those in No. 43, and most important to a complete study of clerical life in pre-Reformation times.

49. The Clarke Papers. Vol. I. Edited by C. H. Firth, M.A. More important for the life of Cromwell than any book published since the well-known work of Carlyle. (*See* Nos. 54, 61 and 62.) (*Out of print.*)

50. The Nicholas Papers. Vol. II. (*See* Nos. 40, 57, and Third Series, No. 31.)

51. Accounts of the Obedientiars of Abingdon Abbey. Edited by R. E. G. Kirk.

52. Wardrobe Accounts of Henry Earl of Derby (afterwards Henry IV.). Edited by Miss Toulmin Smith, with the co-operation of the Historical Society of East Prussia.

53. The Camden Miscellany, Vol. IX., containing: 1. Visitations of Churches in the Patronage of St. Paul's Cathedral. Edited by the Rev. W. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. 2. "The Spousells" of the Princess Mary, daughter of Henry VII., in 1508. Edited by James Gairdner. 3. Original Letters from the Bishops to the Privy Council in 1564. Edited by Miss Mary Bateson. 4. Papers relating to Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford. Edited by C. H. Firth, M.A. 5. Hamilton Papers, Addenda. Edited by S. R. Gardiner, LL.D. 6. Memoirs of Nathaniel, Lord Crewe. Edited by the Rev. Andrew Clark. 7. The Journal of Major Richard Ferrier, M.P., during a tour in France in 1687. Edited by Richard F. E. and John A. H. Ferrier. (*Out of print.*)

54. The Clarke Papers. Vol. II. (*Out of print.*) (*See* Nos. 49, 61 and 62.)

55. Visitations of Churches belonging to St. Paul's Cathedral in 1297 and in 1458. Edited by W. Sparrow Simpson, D.D., F.S.A. (*Out of print.*)

56. The Archpriest Controversy. Vol. I. Documents relating to the dissensions of the Roman Catholic Clergy, 1597–1602. Edited from the Petyt MSS., by T. G. Law. (*See* No. 58.)

57. Nicholas Papers. Vol. III. (*See* Nos. 40 and 50, and Third Series, No. 31.)

58. The Archpriest Controversy. Vol. II. Edited by T. G. Law. (*See* No. 56.)

59. The Political Correspondence of the Duke of Newcastle, 1765–1767. Edited by Miss Mary Bateson.

60. The Narrative of General Venables, and other Papers relating to the Jamaica Expedition, 1655. Edited by C. H. Firth, M.A.

61. The Clarke Papers. Vol. III. (*See* Nos. 49, 54 and 62.)

62. The Clarke Papers. Vol. IV. (*See* Nos. 49, 54, and 61.)

THIRD SERIES.

1. The Cely Papers: a Correspondence between Merchants of the Staple in London and Calais, 1477–1487. Edited by H. E. Malden, M.A.
2. The Despatches and Correspondence of John 2nd Earl of Buckinghamshire, Ambassador to the Court of Catherine II., 1762–1765. Vol. I. Edited from the originals in the Foreign Office and in family MSS., by Mrs. D'Arcy Collyer. (*See* No. 3.)
3. The Earl of Buckinghamshire's Correspondence. Vol. II. (*See* No. 2.)
4. The Camden Miscellany, Vol. X., containing: 1. The Journal of Roger Wilbraham, Master of Requests, temp. Elizabeth and James I. Edited by H. Spencer Scott. 2. The Diary of Sir Philip Hoby, 1547–1560. Edited by Edgar Powell. 3. Prince Rupert at Lisbon. Edited by the late S. R. Gardiner, D.C.L.
5. The Diplomatic Correspondence of William Perwich from Paris, 1669–1677. Edited from the Foreign State Papers by Miss M. B. Curran, M.A.
6. Collectanea Anglo-Premonstratensia. Edited from the Bodleian and Additional MSS., by the Right Rev. F. A. Gasquet, D.D. Vol. I. (*See* Nos. 10 and 12.)
7. Despatches relating to the Third Coalition against Napoleon, 1804–1805. Edited from the Foreign Office Correspondence, by J. H. Rose, Litt.D.
8. Records of the Presbyterian Movement in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by Roland G. Usher, Ph.D., Harvard.
9. The State Trials of 1289–1290. Edited from the unpublished Records, by Professor T. F. Tout, M.A., and Miss Hilda Johnstone, M.A.
10. Collectanea Anglo-Premonstratensia. Vol. II. (*See* Nos. 6 and 12.)
11. The Records of the Eastland Company preserved at York. Edited by Miss Maud Sellers.
12. Collectanea Anglo-Premonstratensia. Vol. III. (*See* Nos. 6 and 10.)
13. The Camden Miscellany, Vol. XI., containing: 1. Some unpublished Letters of Gilbert Burnet, the Historian. Edited by Miss H. C. Foxcroft. 2. Extracts from the Papers of Thomas Woodcock, ob. 1695. Edited by G. C. Moore Smith, M.A. 3. The Memoirs of Sir George Courthop, 1616–1685. Edited by Mrs. S. C. Lomas, F.R.Hist.S. 4. The Commonwealth Charter of the City of Salisbury, 1656. Edited by Hubert Hall, F.S.A.
14. The Relation of the Campaign in Germany, 1624–36, by Sydnam Poyntz. Edited from the MS. in the *Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris, by the Rev. A. T. S. Goodrick, M.A., formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford.

*15. The Diary of the Rev. Ralph Josselin, 1616–1683. Edited by E. Hockliffe, M.A.

16. Despatches from Paris, 1784–1789. Edited from the Foreign Office Correspondence, by Oscar Browning, M.A. Vol. I., 1784–1787. (*See* No. 19.)

17. The Bardon Papers: Proceedings against Mary Queen of Scots in 1586. Edited by Conyers Reed, A.M. (Harvard), B.Litt. (Oxon.).

18. The Camden Miscellany, Vol. XII., containing: 1. Two London Chronicles from the collection of John Stow. Edited by C. L. Kingsford, M.A., F.S.A. 2. Life of Sir John Digby, 1605–1645. Edited by Georges Benard, L.-ès-L. 3. Iter Bellicosum: Adam Wheeler, his Account of 1685. Edited by H. E. Malden, M.A. 4. Common Rights at Cottenham and Stretham in Cambridgeshire. Edited by W. Cunningham D.D., F.B.A.

19. Despatches from Paris. Vol. II., 1787–1789. (*See* No. 16.)

20. John of Gaunt's "Register." Edited from the original MSS. in the Public Record Office, by Sidney Armitage-Smith, M.A. Vol. I. (*See* No. 21.)

21. John of Gaunt's "Register." Vol. II. (*See* No. 20.)

22. The Official Diary of Lieutenant-General Adam Williamson, Deputy-Lieutenant of the Tower of London, 1722–1747. Edited by J. C. Fox, Master of the Supreme Court of Judicature.

23. English Merchants and the Spanish Inquisition in the Canaries. Edited by Miss L. de Alberti and Miss A. B. Wallis Chapman, D.Sc.

24. The Essex Papers, 1675–1677. Vol. II. Edited by the Rev. Clement E. Pike. (*See* New Series, No. 47.)

25. The Chronicle of Novgorod, 1016–1471. Translated and Edited by Robert Mitchell, Nevill Forbes, M.A., and C. Raymond Beazley, D.Litt.

26. The Stiffkey Papers; the official papers of Sir Nathaniel Bacon of Stiffkey, Norfolk, 1580–1620. Edited by W. H. Saunders, M.A. (*See* No. 52.)

27. Henry of Bray's Estate Book (Harleston, Northants), 1289–1340. Edited by Miss Dorothy Willis.

*28. Memoirs of the Families of Guise and Raymond (Seventeenth–Eighteenth Centuries). Edited by G. Davies, M.A.

29. The Stonor Family and other Mediæval Papers (Fourteenth–Fifteenth Centuries). Vol. I. Edited by C. L. Kingsford, M.A., F.S.A. (*See* Nos. 30 and 34.) (*Out of print.*)

30. The Stonor Papers. Vol. II. (*See* Nos. 29 and 34.) (*Out of print.*)

31. The Nicholas Papers, Vol. IV. Edited by Sir G. F. Warner, D.Litt., F.B.A. (*See* New Series, Nos. 40, 50, 57.)

32. British Diplomatic Instructions: Vol. I. Sweden, Part i., 1689–1727. Edited by J. F. Chance, M.A.

33. Parliamentary Papers of John Robinson, 1774–1784. Edited by Professor W. T. Laprade, Ph.D.

34. The Camden Miscellany, Vol. XIII., containing: 1. Gesta Dunelmensia, A.D. M°CCC°. Edited by Professor R. K. Richardson, Ph.D. 2. Supplementary Stonor Letters and Papers, 1314–1482. Edited by C. L. Kingsford, M.A., F.S.A. 3. Richard Broughton's Devereux Papers, 1575–1601. Edited by H. E. Malden, M.A. 4. The Voy-

ages of Captain William Jackson, 1642–1645. Edited by V. T. Harlow, B.A., B.Litt. 5. The English Conquest of Jamaica, 1655–1656. Edited by Irene A. Wright, B.A.

35. British Diplomatic Instructions. Vol. II. France, Part i., 1689-1721. Edited by L. G. Wickham Legg, M.A.

36. British Diplomatic Instructions. Vol. III. Denmark, 1689–1789. Edited by J. F. Chance, M.A.

37. The Camden Miscellany, Vol. XIV., containing: 1. Plan of St. Domingo. Narrative of the English Attack on St. Domingo, 1655. Translated and edited by Irene A. Wright, B.A. 2. Embajada Española. Translated and edited by the Rev. H. J. Chaytor, M.A. 3. The Will of Peter de Aqua Blanca, Bishop of Hereford, 1268. Edited by the Rev. Canon C. Eveleigh Woodruff, M.A. 4. The Ransom of John I, King of France, 1360–1370. Edited by Dorothy M. Broome, M.A. 5. Historia Mirabilis Parliamenti, 1386. Edited by May McKisack, M.A., B.Litt.

38. British Diplomatic Instructions. Vol. IV. France, Part ii., 1721–1727. Edited by L. G. Wickham Legg, M.A. (*See* No. 35.)

39. British Diplomatic Instructions. Vol. V. Sweden, Part ii., 1727–1789. Edited by J. F. Chance, M.A. (*See* No. 32.)

40. The Life of Wulfstan. Edited from the original MSS. by R. R. Darlington, B.A.

41. The Camden Miscellany, Vol. XV., containing: 1. A Transcript of "The Red Book" of the Bishopric of Hereford, c. 1290. Edited by the Rev. Canon A. T. Bannister, M.A., F.S.A. 2. Edward II, The Lords Ordainers, and Piers Gaveston's Jewels and Horses, 1312–1313. Edited by R. A. Roberts. 3. Table of Canterbury Archbishopric Charters. Edited by Irene J. Churchill. 4. An Early Admiralty Case, A.D. 1361. Edited by Charles Johnson, M.A., F.S.A. 5. Select Tracts and Table Books relating to English Weights and Measures, 1100–1742. Edited by Hubert Hall, Litt.D., F.S.A., and Frieda J. Nicholas, M.A., F.S.S. 6. An English Prisoner in Paris during the Terror, 1793–1794. Edited by V. T. Harlow, M.A., B.Litt.

42. Henry Elsing's Notes of the Debates in the House of Lords, 1626–1628. Edited by Professor F. W. Relf, Ph.D.

43. British Diplomatic Instructions. Vol. VI. France. Part iii., 1727–1744. Edited by L. G. Wickham Legg, M.A. (*See* Nos. 35 and 38.)

44. Private Correspondence of Chesterfield and Newcastle, 1744–1746. Edited by Sir Richard Lodge, LL.D., Litt.D.

45. General and Provincial Chapters of the English Black Monks. Vol. I., 1215–1540. Edited by W. A. Pantin, M.A. (*See* No. 47.)

46. British Diplomatic Representatives, 1689–1789. Edited by D. B. Horn, M.A., D.Litt. (*See* No. 50.)

47. General and Provincial Chapters of the English Black Monks. Vol. II., 1215–1540. (*See* No. 45.)

48. Diplomatic Correspondence of Richard II., 1377–1399. Edited by Edouard Perroy, D.-ès-Lettres.

49. British Diplomatic Instructions. Vol. VII. France. Part iv., 1744–1789. Edited by L. G. Wickham Legg, M.A. (*See* Nos. 35, 38 and 43.

50. British Diplomatic Representatives, 1789–1852. Edited by S. T. Bindoff, M.A., Miss Malcolm Smith, M.A., and Professor C. K. Webster, M.A., F.B.A. (*See* No. 46.)

51. Rotuli Parliamentorum Anglie hactenus inediti, 1279–1373. Edited by H. G. Richardson, M.A., B.Sc., and G. O. Sayles, M.A., D.Litt.

52. Camden Miscellany, Vol. XVI., containing: 1. Thos. Sherley's Journal (Constantinople, etc.), 1602–1605. Edited by Sir E. Denison Ross, C.I.E., D.Litt. 2. Survey of the Counties of England, 1635. Edited by L. G. Wickham Legg, M.A. 3. Inventory of Sir John Eliot's goods, 1632, by Professor Harold Hulme, Ph.D. 4. Supplementary Stiffkey Papers (Sir Nathaniel Bacon), 1590–1620. Edited by F. W. Brooks, M.A. (*See* No. 26.)

53. Robert Loder's Farm Journal, 1610–1620. Edited by G. E. Fussell.

54. General and Provincial Chapters of the English Black Monks. Edited by W. A. Pantin, M.A., Ph.D., F.S.A. Vol. III., 1215–1540. (*See* Nos. 45 and 47.)

55. Gervase Holles' Memoirs of the Holles Family, 1520–1642. Edited by A. C. Wood, M.A., B.Litt., D.Phil.

56. John of Gaunt's Register 1379–1383, Vol. I. Edited by the late Miss Eleanor Lodge, C.B.E., D.Litt., Litt.D., and R. Somerville, M.A. (*See* Nos. 20, 21 and 57.)

57. John of Gaunt's Register, Vol. II. (*In the press.*) (*See* Nos. 20, 21 and 56.)

58. Early Charters of St. Paul's Cathedral (Part I). Edited by Miss Marion Gibbs, with a Preface by Professor F. M. Stenton, M.A., F.B.A. (*In the press.*)

British Diplomatic Representatives, 1509–1688. Edited by Miss D. M. Brodie, Ph.D., J. F. Chance, M.A., and R. B. Wernham, M.A., assisted by S. T. Bindoff, M.A., and F. J. Weaver, M.A. (*In the press*). (*See* Nos. 46 and 50.)

Lieven Letters, 1822–1834. Vol. I. Edited by E. Jones Parry, M.A. (*In the press.*)

Lieven Letters. Vol. II. (*In preparation.*)

Correspondence relating to Canning's Ministry, 1826–7. Edited by A. Aspinall, M.A., Ph.D. (*In the press.*)

The Proceedings under the Dictum de Kenilworth. Edited by Professor F. M. Powicke, M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A., and M. Tyson, M.A., Ph.D. (*In preparation.*)

British Reports on Trade and Politics in Latin America, 1824–27. Edited by R. A. Humphreys, M.A. (*In preparation.*)

Ministers Accounts of the Earldom of Cornwall, 1296–7. Vol. I. Edited by Miss M. Midgley, M.A. (*In preparation.*)

Ministers Accounts of the Earldom of Cornwall. Vol. II.

The Letters of Arnold of Lisieux. New edition by F. Barlow, M.A.

Camden Miscellany. Vol. XVII. (*In preparation.*)

Walter of Hemingburgh. Vol. I. Edited by H. Rothwell, B.A., Ph.D. (*In preparation.*)

Walter of Hemingburgh. Vol. II.

Walter of Hemingburgh. Vol. III.

Historia Roffensis, 1315–1350. Edited by H. G. Richardson, M.A., B.Sc.

4. MISCELLANEOUS PUBLICATIONS OF THE ROYAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY: NEW SERIES.

1. Guide to British Commercial and Shipping Statistics, 1696–1782. Edited by Professor G. N. Clark, M.A. (*In the press.*)
2. Handbook of British Chronology. Edited by Professor F. M. Powicke, M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A. (*In the press.*)
3. Handbook of British Currency. Edited by A. E. Feaveryear, D.Sc. (*In preparation.*)
4. List and Index of Parliamentary Papers, 1700–1800. Edited by E. Wagstaff, M.A. (*In preparation.*)
5. Bibliography of the Historical Literature relating to English Portraits. Edited by Dr. S. H. Steinberg.
6. Guide to the Materials for the study of Anglo-German Relations in the 19th century. Edited by Dr. Hans Goldschmidt.

5. ANNUAL BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Writings on British History, 1934. Compiled by A. T. Milne, M.A. 10s.

The order of publication for Volumes in the press or in preparation is provisional.

BIBL. LONDIN. UNIV.

SHL
WITHDRAWN

UL 21 DEC 1967